TREATISES

OF

1. *The Liberty of Prophesying.*
2. *Prayer* Ex Tempore.
3. *Episcopacie.*

TOGETHER WITH

A Sermon preached at Oxon. *on the Anniversary of the* 5. *of* November.

BIBL. CANT. ACAD.

By IER. TAYLOR, *D. D.* Chaplaine in Ordinary to His MAJESTY.





LONDON,
Printed for R. ROYSTON, at the Angel in *Ivie-lane*. 1648.

~~874.97~~
'74-27C4



BIBL. CANT. ACAD.

ΘΕΟΛΟΓΙΑ ἘΚΛΕΚΤΙΚΗ.

THE

Liberty of Prophesying.

With it's just limits and temper.

W. Marshall sculpsit



275.4.7

ΘΕΟΛΟΓΙΑ ΕΚΛΕΚΤΙΚΗ.

A DISCOURSE OF The Liberty of Prophesying.

SHEWING

THE UNREASONABLENES of prescribing to other mens Faith, and the Iniquity of persecuting differing opinions.

By IER: TAYLOR, *D. D.* Chaplaine in Ordinarie to His MAJESTIE.



BIBL. CANT. ACAD.

LONDON,
Printed for R. ROYSTON, at the Angel in Ivie-lane. 1647.

~~875:97~~
'74-2705

To the Right Honourable CHRISTOPHER Lord HATTON, Baron HATTON of *Kirby*; Comptroler of His Majesties Houshold, and one of His Majesties most Honourable Priyie Councell.

My Lord,

IN this great Storm which hath dasht the Vessell of the Church all in pieces, I have been cast upon the Coast of *Wales*, and in a little Boat thought to have enjoyed that rest and quietnesse, which in *England* in a greater I could not hope for: Here I cast Anchor, and thinking to ride safely, the Storm followed me with so impetuous violence, that it broke a Cable, and I lost my Anchor: And here again I was exposed to the mercy of the Sea, and the gentleneſſe of an Element that could neither distinguish things nor persons. And but that he who stilleth the raging of the Sea, and the noise of his Waves, and the madnesse of his

people, had provided a Plank for me, I had been loſt to all the opportunities of content or ſtudy. But I know not whether I have been more preſerved by the courteſies of my friends, or the gentleneſſe and mercies of a noble Enemy: Οἱ δὲ βάρβαροι παρεῖχον οὐ τὴν τυχοῦσαν φιλανθρωπίαν ἡμῖν, ἀνάψαντες γὰρ πυρὰν πάντας ἡμᾶς διὰ τὸν ὑετὸν τὸν ἐφεστῶτα καὶ διὰ τὸ ψῦχος. And now ſince I have come aſhoar, I have been gathering a few ſticks to warm me, a few books to entertain my thoughts, and divert them from the perpetuall Meditation of my private Troubles, and the publike Dyſcraſy, but thoſe which I could obtain were ſo few and ſo impertinent, and unuſefull to any great purpoſes, that I began to be ſad upon a new ſtock, and full of apprehenſion that I ſhould live unprofitably, and die obſcurely, and be forgotten, and my bones thrown into ſome common charnell houſe, without any name or note to diſtinguiſh me from thoſe who only ſerved their Generation by filling the number of Citizens, and who could pretend to no thanks or reward from the Publike, beyond a *jus trium liberorum.* While I was troubled with theſe thoughts, and buſie to find out an opportunity of doing ſome good in my ſmall proportion, ſtill the cares of the publike did ſo intervene, that it was as impoſſible to ſeparate my deſign from relating to the preſent, as to exempt my ſelfe from the participation of the common calamity; ſtill halfe my thoughts was (in deſpite of all my diverſions and arts of avocation) fixt upon and mingled with the preſent concernments: ſo that beſides them I could

not

not goe. Now becauſe the great Queſtion is concerning Religion, and in that alſo my Scene lies, I reſolved here to fix my conſiderations, eſpecially when I obſerved the wayes of promoting the ſeverall opinions which now are buſie, to be ſuch, as beſides that they were moſt troubleſome to me, and ſuch as I could by no meanes be friends withall, they were alſo ſuch as to my underſtanding, did the moſt apparently differve their ends whoſe deſign in advancing their own opinions was pretended for Religion: For as contrary as cruelty is to mercy, as tyranny to charity, ſo is warre and bloodſhed to the meekneſſe and gentleneſſe of Chriſtian Religion: And however that there are ſome exterminating ſpirits who think God to delight in humane ſacrifices, as if that Oracle—Καὶ χεραὰς ἅδη χ τῷ πάϛι πέμπϵ φῶτα, had come from the Father of Spirits, yet if they were capable of coole and tame Homilies, or would hear men of other opinions give a quiet account without invincible reſolutions never to alter their perſwaſions, I am very much perſwaded it would not be very hard to diſpute ſuch men into mercies and compliances, and Tolerations mutuall, ſuch I ſay, who are zealous for Jeſus Chriſt; then whoſe Doctrine never was any thing more mercifull and humane, whoſe leſſons were ſofter then Nard, or the juice of the Candian Olive: Upon the firſt apprehenſion, I deſign'd a Diſcourſe to this purpoſe, with as much greedineſſe as if I had thought it poſſible with my Arguments to have perſwaded the rough and hard handed Souldiers to have disbanded preſently: For

I had often thought of the Prophecy that in the Goſpel, *our ſwords ſhould be turned into plowſhares, and our Speares into pruning hooks*; I knew that no tittle ſpoken by Gods Spirit could return unperform'd and ineffectuall, and I was certain, that ſuch was the excellency of Chriſt's Doctrine, that if men would obey it, Chriſtians ſhould never warre one againſt another; in the mean time I conſidered not, that it was *prædictio conſilii, non eventus*, till I ſaw what men were now doing, and ever had done ſince the heats and primitive fervours did coole, and the love of intereſts ſweld higher then the love of Chriſtianity; but then on the other ſide, I began to fear that whatever I could ſay would be as ineffectuall, as it could be reaſonable: For if thoſe excellent words which our bleſſed Maſter ſpake, could not charm the tumult of our ſpirits, I had little reaſon to hope that one of the meaneſt and moſt ignorant of his ſervants could advance the end of that which he cals his great, and his old, and his new Commandement, ſo well as the excellency of his own Spirit and diſcourſes could. And yet ſince he who knew every event of things, and the ſucceſſe and efficacy of every Doctrine; and that very much of it to moſt men, and all of it to ſome men would be ineffectuall, yet was pleaſed to conſign our duty that it might bee a direction to them that would, and a conviction and a Teſtimony againſt them that would not obey, I thought it might not misbecome my duty and endevours to plead for peace and charity, and forgiveneſſe and permiſſions mutuall, although I had reaſon to believe

that

that ſuch is the iniquity of men, and they ſo indiſpoſed to receive ſuch impreſſes, that I had as good plow the Sands, or till the Aire, as perſwade ſuch Doctrines, which deſtroy mens intereſts, and ſerve no end but the great end of a happy eternity, and what is in order to it. But becauſe the events of things are in Gods diſpoſition, and I knew them not, and becauſe if I had known my good purpoſes would be totally ineffectuall as to others, yet my own deſignation and purpoſes would be of advantage to my ſelfe, who might from Gods mercy expect the retribution which he is pleaſed to promiſe to all pious intendments; I reſolved to encounter with all Objections, and to doe ſomething to which I ſhould be determined by the conſideration of the preſent diſtemperatures and neceſſities, by my own thoughts, by the Queſtions and Scruples, the Sects and names, the intereſts and animoſities which at this day, and for ſome years paſt have exerciſed and diſquieted Chriſtendome.

Thus farre I diſcourſt my ſelfe into imployment, and having come thus farre, I knew not how to get farther, for I had heard of a great experience, how difficult it was to make Brick without Straw, and here I had even ſeene my deſign blaſted in the bud, and I deſpaired in the Calends of doing what I purpoſed in the Ides before: For I had no Books of my own here, nor any in the voiſinage, and but that I remembred the reſult of ſome of thoſe excellent Diſcourſes, I had heard your Lordſhip make when I was ſo happy as in private to gather up what your

temperance and modeſty, forbids to be publick, I had come *in prælia inermis*, and like enough might have far'd accordingly. I had this only advantage beſides; that I have choſen a Subject, in which, if my own reaſon does not abuſe me, I needed no other books or aides, then what a man carries with him on horſe-back, I meane the common principles of Chriſtianity, and thoſe ἀξιώματα which men uſe in the tranſactions of the ordinary occurrences of civill ſociety; and upon the ſtrength of them and ſome other collaterall aſſiſtances I have run through it *utcunque*, and the ſum of the following Diſcourſes, is nothing but the ſenſe of theſe words of Scripture;

1 Cor. 13. That ſince *we know in part, and propheſy in part, and that now we ſee through a glaſſe darkly*, wee ſhould not *deſpiſe* or *contemn* perſons not ſo knowing as our ſelves, but *him that is weak in the faith we ſhould receive, but not to doubtfull diſputations*; Therefore certainly to charity, and not to vexations, not to thoſe which are the idle effects of impertinent wranglings. And provided they keep cloſe to the *foundation*, which is *Faith and Obedience*, let them *build upon this foundation matter more or leſſe precious*, yet if the foundation be intire, they *ſhall be ſaved with or without loſſe*. And ſince we profeſſe our ſelves ſervants of ſo meek a Maſter, and Diſciples of ſo charitable an Inſtitute, *Let us walk worthy of the vocation wherewith we are called with all lowlineſſe and meekneſſe, with long ſuffering, forbearing one another in love*; for this is the beſt en-

Rom. 14.

Epheſ. 4. 2, 3.

deavouring

deavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit, when it is faſt tyed *in the bond of peace*. And although it be a duty of Chriſtianity, that *we all ſpeak the ſame thing, that there be no diviſions among us, but that we be perfectly joyned together in the ſame mind, and in the ſame judgement*, yet this unity is to bee eſtimated according to the unity of faith, in things neceſſary, in matters of Creed, and Articles fundamentall; for as for other things, it is more to be wiſhed then to be hoped for; there are ſome *doubtfull Diſputations*, and in ſuch *the Scribe, the Wiſe, the Diſputer of this world*, are moſt commonly very farre from certainty, and many times from truth: There are diverſity of perſwaſions in matters adiaphorous, *as meats and drinks, and holy dayes, &c.* and both parties, the affirmative and the negative, affirm and deny with innocence enough, for *the obſerver and he that obſerves not*, intend both to God; and God is our common Maſter, we all fellow ſervants, and *not the judge of each other*, in matters of conſcience or *doubtfull Diſputation*: And every man that *hath faith muſt have it to himſelfe before God*, but no man muſt either in ſuch matters *judge his brother or ſet him at nought*; but *let us follow after the things which make for peace, and things wherewith one may edifie another*: And the way to doe that is not by knowledge, but by charity, *for knowledge puffeth up, but charity edifieth*; and ſince there is not in every man *the ſame knowledge, but the conſcience of ſome are weak; as my liberty muſt not be judged of another mans weak conſcience*, ſo muſt not I pleaſe my ſelfe ſo much

1 Cor. 1. 10.

Rom. 14.

1 Cor. 8. 1.

Verſ. 7.

1 Cor. 10. 29.

much in my right opinion, but I muſt alſo take order that his *weak conſcience be not offended or deſpiſed*, for no man muſt *ſeek his own but every man anothers wealth*: And although we *muſt contend earneſtly for the faith*, yet *above all things we muſt put on charity which is the bond of perfectneſſe*: And therefore this contention muſt be with arms fit for *the Chriſtian warfare*, *the ſword of the Spirit*, *and the ſhield of Faith*, *and preparation of the Goſpel of peace inſtead of ſhooes*, *and a helmet of ſalvation*, but not with other armes; for a Church-man muſt not be πάτακτικὸς, *a ſtriker*, *for the weapons of our warfare are not carnall but ſpirituall*, and the perſons that uſe them ought to be *gentle*, *and eaſy to be intreated*, and we *muſt give an account of our faith to them that ask us with meekneſſe and humility*, *for ſo is the will of God*, *that with well doing ye may put to ſilence the ignorance of fooliſh men*. Theſe and thouſands more to the ſame purpoſe are the Doctrines of Chriſtianity, whoſe ſenſe and intendment I have proſecuted in the following Diſcourſe, being very much diſpleaſed that ſo many opinions and new doctrines are commenc'd among us, but more troubled that every man that hath an opinion thinks his own and other mens ſalvation is concern'd in its maintenance, but moſt of all that men ſhould be perſecuted and afflicted for diſagreeing in ſuch opinions which they cannot with ſufficient grounds obtrude upon others neceſſarily, becauſe they cannot propound them infallibly, and becauſe they have no warrant from Scripture ſo to doe: For if I ſhall tie other men to believe

Ibid.

Coloſ. 3. 14.

my

my opinion, becauſe I think I have place of Scripture, which ſeems to warrant it to my underſtanding, why may he not ſerve up another diſh to me in the ſame dreſſe, and exact the ſame task of me to believe the contradictory: And then ſince all the Hereticks in the world have offered to prove their Articles by the ſame meanes by which true believers propound theirs, it is neceſſary that ſome ſeparation either of Doctrine or of perſons be clearly made, that all pretences may not be admitted, nor any juſt Allegations be rejected; and yet that in ſome other Queſtions whether they be truly or falſly pretended if not evidently or demonſtratively, there may be conſiderations had to the perſons of men and to the Laws of charity more then to the triumphing in any opinion or doctrine not ſimply neceſſary. Now becauſe ſome doctrines are clearly not neceſſary, and ſome are abſolutely neceſſary, why may not the firſt ſeparation be made upon this difference, and Articles neceſſary be only urg'd as neceſſary, and the reſt left to men indifferently, as they were by the Scripture indeterminately. And it were well if men would as much conſider themſelves as the Doctrines, and think that they may as well be deceiv'd by their own weakneſſe, as perſwaded by the Arguments of a Doctrine which other men, as wiſe, call inevident. For it is a hard caſe that we ſhall think all Papiſts and Anabaptiſts and Sacramentaries to be fooles and wicked perſons, certainly among all theſe Sects there are very many wiſe men and good men, as well as erring; and although ſome zeales are ſo hot, and their eyes ſo

inflamed with their ardors, that they doe not think their Adverſaries look like other men, yet certainly we find by the reſults of their diſcourſes, and the tranſactions of their affaires of civill ſociety, that they are men that ſpeak and make ſyllogiſmes, and uſe reaſon, and read Scripture, and although they do no more underſtand all of it, then we doe, yet they endeavour to underſtand as much as concerns them, even all that they can, even all that concerns repentance from dead works, and faith in our Lord Jeſus Chriſt: And therefore me thinks this alſo ſhould be another conſideration diſtinguiſhing the perſons, for if the perſons be Chriſtians in their lives, and Chriſtians in their profeſſion, if they acknowledge the Eternall Sonne of God for their Maſter and their Lord, and live in all relations as becomes perſons making ſuch profeſſions, why then ſhould I hate ſuch perſons whom God loves, and who love God, who are partakers of Chriſt, and Chriſt hath a title to them, who dwell in Chriſt, and Chriſt in them, becauſe their underſtandings have not been brought up like mine, have not had the ſame Maſters, they have not met with the ſame books, nor the ſame company, or have not the ſame intereſt, or are not ſo wiſe, or elſe are wiſer, (that is, for ſome reaſon or other which I neither doe underſtand, nor ought to blame) have not the ſame opinions that I have, and do not determine their Schoole Queſtions to the ſenſe of my Sect or intereſt.

But now I know before hand, that thoſe men who will endure none but their own Sect, will make all manner

manner of attemps againſt theſe purpoſes of charity and compliance, and ſay I, or doe I what I can, will tell all their Proſelytes that I preach indifferency of Religion, that I ſay it is no matter how we believe, nor what they profeſſe: But that they may comply with all Sects, and doe violence to their own conſciences, that they may be ſav'd in all Religions, and ſo make way for a *colluvies* of Hereſies, and by conſequence deſtroy all Religion. Nay, they will ſay worſe then all this, and but that I am not uſed to their phraſes and formes of declamation, I am perſwaded I might repreſent fine Tragedies before hand. And this will be ſuch an objection, that although I am moſt confident I ſhall make apparent to be as falſe and ſcandalous as the Objectors themſelves are zealous and impatient, yet beſides that, I believe the Objection will come where my anſwers will not come, or not be underſtood; I am alſo confident that in defiance and incurioſneſſe of all that I ſhall ſay, ſome men will perſiſt pertinaciouſly in the accuſation, and deny my concluſion in deſpite of mee: well, but however I will try.

And firſt I anſwer, that whatſoever is againſt the foundation of Faith, or contrary to good life and the lawes of obedience, or deſtructive to humane ſociety, and the publick and juſt intereſts of bodies politick, is out of the limits of my Queſtion, and does not pretend to complyance or toleration: So that I allow no indifferency, nor any countenance to thoſe Religions whoſe principles deſtroy Govern-

ment, nor to thoſe Religions (if there be any ſuch) that teach ill life, nor doe I think that any thing will now excuſe from beliefe of a fundamentall Article, except ſtupidity or ſottiſhneſſe and naturall inhability. This alone is ſufficient anſwer to this vanity, but I have much more to ſay.

Secondly, The intendment of my Diſcourſe is, that permiſſions ſhould be in Queſtions ſpeculative, indeterminable, curious, and unneceſſary, and that men would not make more neceſſities then God made, which indeed are not many. The fault I find and ſeek to remedy is, that men are ſo dogmaticall and reſolute in their opinions, and impatient of others diſagreeings in thoſe things wherein is no ſufficient meanes of union and determination, but that men ſhould let opinions and problemes keep their own forms, and not be obtruded as axiomes, nor queſtions in the vaſt collection of the ſyſteme of Divinity, be adopted into the family of Faith: And I think I have reaſon to deſire this.

Thirdly, It is hard to ſay, that he who would not have men put to death, or puniſhed corporally for ſuch things, for which no humane Authority is ſufficient either for cogniſance or determination, or competent for infliction, that he perſwades to an indifferency, when he referres to another Judicatory, which is competent, ſufficient, infallible, juſt, and highly ſevere. No man or company of men can judge or puniſh our thoughts, or ſecret purpoſes whileſt they ſo remaine, and yet it will be unequall to ſay, that he who owns this Doctrine preaches it

lawfull

lawfull for men to think or purpoſe what they will. And ſo it is in matters of doubtfull diſputation (ſuch as are the diſtinguiſhing Articles of moſt of the Sects of Chriſtendome:) So it is in matters intellectuall (which are not cognoſcible by a ſecular power) in matters ſpirituall (which are to be diſcerned by ſpirituall Authority, which cannot make corporall inflictions) and in Queſtions indeterminate, (which are doubtfully propounded or obſcurely, and therefore may be *in utramque partem* diſputed or believed;) for God alone muſt be Judge of theſe matters, who alone is Maſter of our ſouls, and hath a dominion over humane underſtanding, and he that ſayes this, does not ſay that indifferency is perſwaded, becauſe God alone is Judge of erring perſons.

Fourthly, No part of this Diſcourſe teaches or encourages variety of Sects, and contradiction in opinions, but ſuppoſes them already in being, and therefore ſince there are, and ever were, and ever will be variety of opinions, becauſe there is variety of humane underſtandings, and uncertainty in things, no man ſhould be too forward in determining all Queſtions, nor ſo forward in preſcribing to others, nor invade that liberty which God hath left to us intire by propounding many things obſcurely, and by exempting our ſouls and underſtandings from all power externally compulſory: So that the reſtraint is laid upon mens tyranny, but no licenſe given to mens opinions, they are not conſidered in any of the Concluſions, but in the premiſes only as an Argument to exhort to charity. So that if I perſwade a licenſe

of diſcrediting any thing which God hath commanded us to believe, and allow a liberty where God hath not allowed it, let it be ſhewn, and let the Objection preſſe as hard as it can; but to ſay that men are too forward in condemning where God hath declared no ſentence nor preſcribed any rule; is to diſſwade from tyranny, not to encourage licentiouſneſſe, is to take away a licenſe of judging, not to give a licenſe of dogmatizing what every one pleaſe, or as may beſt ſerve his turn. And for the other part of the Objection;

Fifthly, This Diſcourſe is ſo farre from giving leave to men to profeſſe any thing though they believe the contrary, that it takes order that no man ſhall bee put to it, for I earneſtly contend that another mans opinion ſhall be no rule to mine, and that my opinion ſhall be no ſnare and prejudice to my ſelſe, that men uſe one another ſo charitably and ſo gently, that no errour or violence tempt men to hypocriſy, this very thing being one of the Arguments I uſe to perſwade permiſſions, leſt compulſion introduce hypocriſy, and make ſincerity troubleſome and unſafe.

Sixthly, If men would not call all opinions by the name of Religion, and ſuperſtructures by the name of fundamentall Articles, and all fancies by the glorious appellative of Faith, this objection would have no pretence or footing, ſo that it is the diſeaſe of the men, not any cauſe that is miniſtred by ſuch precepts of charity that makes them perpetually clamorous: And it would be hard to ſay that

that ſuch Phyſitians are incurious of their Patients, and neglectfull of their health, who ſpeak againſt the unreaſonableneſſe of ſuch Empericks that would cut off a mans head if they ſee but a Wart upon his cheek, or a dimple upon his chin, or any lines in his face to diſtinguiſh him from another man; the caſe is altogether the ſame, and we may as well decree a Wart to be mortall as a various opinion in *re alioqui non neceſſariâ* to be capitall and damnable.

For I conſider, that there are but few Doctrines of Chriſtianity, that were ordered to be preached to all the world, to every ſingle perſon, and made a neceſſary Article of his explicite beliefe: Other Doctrines which are all of them not ſimply neceſſary, are either ſuch as are not clearly revealed, or ſuch as are: If they be clearely revealed, and that I know ſo too, or may, but for my own fault, I am not to be excuſed, but for this I am to be left to Gods judgement, unleſſe my fault be externally ſuch as to be cognoſcible and puniſhable in humane judicatory: But then, if it be not ſo revealed but that wiſe men and good men differ in their opinions, it is a clear caſe, it is not *inter dogmata neceſſaria ſimpliciter*, and then it is certain I may therefore ſafely disbelieve it, becauſe I may be ſafely ignorant of it: For if I may with innocence be ignorant, then to know it or believe it, is not ſimply obligatory; ignorance is abſolutely inconſiſtent with ſuch an obligation, becauſe it is deſtructive

and

and a plaine negative to its performance, and if I doe my honeſt endeavour to underſtand it, and yet doe not attain it, it is certain that is not obligatory to me ſo much as by accident, for no obligation can preſſe the perſon of a man, if it be impoſſible, no man is bound to doe more then his beſt, no man is bound to have an excellent underſtanding, or to be infallible, or to be wiſer then he can, for theſe are things that are not in his choyce, and therefore not a matter of a Law, nor ſubject to reward and puniſhment; ſo that where ignorance of the Article is not a ſin, there disbelieving it in the right ſenſe, or believing it in the wrong, is not breach of any duty, eſſentially or accidentally neceſſary, neither in the thing it ſelfe, nor to the perſon; that is, he is neither bound to the Article, nor to any endeavours or antecedent acts of volition and choyce, and that man who may ſafely bee ignorant of the propoſition, is not tyed at all to ſearch it out, and if not at all to ſearch it, then certainly not to find it: All the obligation we are capable of, is not to be malicious or voluntarily criminall in any kind, and then if by accident we find out a truth, we are obliged to believe it; and ſo will every wiſe or good man doe; indeed he cannot doe otherwiſe: But if he disbelieves an Article without malice, or deſign, or involuntarily, or unknowingly, it is contradiction to ſay it is a ſinne to him who might totally have been ignorant of it; for that he believes it in the wrong ſenſe, it is his

ignorance,

ignorance, and it is impoſſible that where hee hath heartily endeavoured to finde out a truth, that this endeavour ſhould make him guilty of a ſinne, which would never have been laid to his charge, if he had taken no paines at all: His ignorance in this caſe is not a fault at all; poſſibly it might, if there had been no endeavour to have cur'd it.

So that there is wholly a miſtake in this propoſition: For true it is, there are ſome propoſitions, which if a man never heare of, they will not be required of him; and they who cannot read might ſafely be ignorant, that *Melchizedeck* was King of *Salem*; but he who reads it in the Scripture, may not ſafely contradict it, although before that knowledge did arrive to him, he might ſafely have been ignorant of it: But this although it be true, is not pertinent to our Queſtion; For *in ſenſu diviſo* this is true, that which at one time a man may be ignorant of, at ſome other time he may not disbelieve: But *in ſenſu conjuncto* it is falſe; For at what time, and in what circumſtance ſoever it is no ſinne to be ignorant, at that time and in that conjuncture, it is no ſinne to disbelieve; and ſuch is the nature of all Queſtions diſputable, which are therefore not required of us to bee believed in any one particular ſenſe, becauſe the nature of the thing is ſuch as not to be neceſſary to be known at all ſimply and

abſolutely, and ſuch is the ambiguity and cloud of its face and repreſentment as not to be neceſſary ſo much as by accident, and therefore not to the particular ſence of any one perſon.

And yet ſuch is the iniquity of men, that they ſuck in opinions as wild Aſſes doe the wind, without diſtinguiſhing the wholeſome from the corrupted ayre, and then live upon it at a venture, and when all their confidence is built upon zeale and miſtake, yet therefore becauſe they are zealous and miſtaken, they are impatient of contradiction.

But beſides that againſt this I have laid prejudice enough from the dictates of holy Scripture, it is obſervable that this with its appendant degrees, I meane reſtraint of Propheſying, impoſing upon other mens underſtanding, being maſters of their conſciences, and lording it over their Faith, came in with the retinue and traine of Antichriſt, that is, they came as other abuſes and corruptions of the Church did, by reaſon of the iniquity of times, and the cooling of the firſt heats of Chriſtianity, and the encreaſe of intereſt, and the abatements of Chriſtian ſimplicity, when the Churches fortune grew better, and her Sonnes grew worſe, and ſome of her Fathers worſt of all; For in the firſt three hundred years there was no ſign of perſecuting any man for his opinion, though at that time there

there were very horrid opinions commenced, and ſuch which were exemplary and parallel enough to determine this Queſtion; for they then were aſſaulted by new Sects which deſtroyed the common principles of nature, of Chriſtianity, of innocence and publike ſociety; and they who uſed all the meanes Chriſtian and Spirituall for their diſimprovement and conviction, thought not of uſing corporall force, otherwiſe then by blaming ſuch proceedings: And therefore I doe not only urge their not doing it as an Argument of the unlawfulneſſe of ſuch proceeding, but their defying it and ſpeaking againſt ſuch practiſes, as unreaſonable and deſtructive of Chriſtianity: For ſo *Tertullian* is expreſſe, *Humani juris & naturalis poteſtatis, unicuique quod putaverit colere, ſed nec religionis eſt cogere religionem, quæ ſuſcipi debet ſponte non vi:* The ſame is the Doctrine of S. *Cyprian*, *Lactantius*, S. *Hilary*, *Minutius Felix*, *Sulpitius Severus*, S. *Chryſoſtome*, S. *Hierom*, S. *Auſtin*, *Damaſcen*, *Theophylact*, *Socrates Scholaſticus*, and S. *Bernard*, as they are ſeverally referr'd to and urg'd upon occaſion in the following Diſcourſe. Ad Scapulat.

To which I adde, that all wiſe Princes till they were overborn with faction or ſollicited by peeviſh perſons, gave Toleration to differing Sects, whoſe opinions did not diſturb the publike intereſt: But at firſt, there were ſome hereticall perſons that were alſo impatient of an

Adverſary, and they were the men who at firſt entreated the Emperours to perſecute the Catholicks; but till foure hundred yeares after Chriſt, no Catholick perſons, or very few, did provoke the ſecular arme, or implore its aide againſt the Hereticks, ſave only that *Arrius* behav'd himſelfe ſo ſeditiouſly and tumultuarily, that the *Nicene* Fathers procur'd a temporary Decree for his relegation, but it was ſoon taken off and God left to be his Judge, who indeed did it to ſome purpoſe, when he was truſted with it and the matter wholly left to him.

But as the Ages grew worſe, ſo men grew more cruell and unchriſtian, and in the Greek Church *Atticus*, and *Neſtorius* of *Conſtantinople*, *Theodoſius* of *Synada*, and ſome few others who had forgotten the mercies of their great Maſter, and their own duty, grew implacable and furious and impatient of contradiction. It was a bold and an arrogant ſpeech which *Neſtorius* made in his Sermon before *Theodoſius* the younger, *Da mihi, O Imperator, terram ab hæreticis repurgatam, & ego tibi viciſſim cœlum dabo : Diſperde mecum hæreticos, & ego tecum diſperdam Perſas :* It was as groundleſſe and unwarrantable, as it was bloody and inhumane.

And we ſee the contrary events prove truer, then this groundleſſe and unlearned promiſe; for *Theodoſius* and *Valentinian* were proſperous Princes,

Princes, and have to all Ages a precious memory, and the reputation of a great piety; but they were ſo farre from doing what *Neſtorius* had ſuggeſted, that they reſtrained him from his violence and immanity, and *Theodoſius* did highly commend the good Biſhop *Proclus* for his ſweetneſſe of deportment towards erring perſons, far above the cruelty of his Predeceſſor *Atticus*: And the experience which Chriſtendom hath had in this laſt Age is Argument enough, that Toleration of differing opinions is ſo farre from diſturbing the publick peace, or deſtroying the intereſt of Princes and Common-Wealths, that it does advantage to the publick, it ſecures peace, becauſe there is not ſo much as the pretence of Religion left to ſuch perſons to contend for it, being already indulged to them. When *France* fought againſt the *Huguenots*, the ſpilling of her own blood was argument enough of the imprudence of that way of promoting Religion; but ſince ſhe hath given permiſſion to them, the world is witneſſe how proſperous ſhe hath been ever ſince: But the great inſtance is in the differing temper, Government and ſucceſſe which *Margaret* of *Parma*, and the Duke of *Alva* had: The clemency of the firſt had almoſt extinguiſhed the flame; but when ſhe was removed, D'*Alva* ſucceeded and managed the matter of Religion with fire and ſword; he made the flame ſo great,

that his Religion and his Prince too hath both been almoſt quite turned out of the Countrey. *Pelli è medio ſapientiam, quoties vi res agitur*, ſaid *Ennius*; and therefore the beſt of men, and the moſt glorious of Princes were alwayes ready to give Toleration, but never to make executions for matters diſputable: *Euſebius* in his ſecond Book of the life of *Conſtantine* reports theſe words of the *Emperour*, *Parem cum fidelibus ii qui errant, pacis & quietis fruitionem gaudentes accipiant: Ipſa ſiquidem communicationis & ſocietatis reſtitutio ad rectam etiam veritatis viam perducere poteſt. Nemo cuiquam moleſtus ſit, quiſque quod animo deſtinat hoc etiam faciat.*

And indeed there is great reaſon for Princes to give Toleration to diſagreeing perſons, whoſe opinions by faire meanes cannot be altered; for if the perſons be confident, they will ſerve God according to their perſwaſions; and if they be publikely prohibited, they will privately convene, and then all thoſe inconveniences and miſchiefes which are Arguments againſt the permiſſion of Conventicles, are Arguments for the publick permiſſions of differing Religions, becauſe the denying of the publick worſhip will certainly produce private Conventicles, againſt which all wiſe Princes and Common-Wealths have upon great reaſons made Edicts and ſevere Sanctions, *Quicquid enim agitur abſente*

abſente rege, in caput ejus plerunque redundat, ſay the Politicks: For the face of a man is as the face of a Lion, and ſcatters all baſe machinations which breath not but in the dark: It is a proverbiall ſaying, *quod nimia familiaritas ſervorum eſt conſpiratio adverſus Dominum*, and they who for their ſecurity runne into grots and cellars, and retirements, think that they being upon the defenſive, thoſe Princes and thoſe Lawes that drive them to it are their Enemies, and therefore they cannot be ſecure, unleſſe the power of the one, and the obligation of the other be leſſened and reſcinded; and then the being reſtrained and made miſerable, endeares the diſcontented perſons mutually, and makes more hearty and dangerous Confederations. King *Iames* of bleſſed memory, in his Letters to the States of the United Provinces, dated *6 March.* 1613. Thus wrote····*Magis autem è re fore ſi ſopiantur authoritate publicâ, ita ut prohibeatis Miniſtros veſtros ne eas diſputationes in ſuggeſtum aut ad plebem ferant, ac diſtrictè imperetis ut pacem colant ſe invicem Tolerando in iſtâ opinionum ac ſententiarum diſcrepantiâ:*····*Eoque juſtiùs videmur vobis hoc ipſum ſuadere debere quòd neutram comperimus adeò deviam ut non poſſint & cum fidei Chriſtianæ veritate, & cum animarum ſalute conſiſtere, &c.* The like Councell in the diviſions of *Germany*, at the firſt Reformation was thought reaſo-

reaſonable by the Emperour *Ferdinand*, and his excellent Sonne *Maximilian*; For they had obſerved that violence did exaſperate, was unbleſſed, unſucceſſefull and unreaſonable, and therefore they made Decrees of Toleration, and appointed tempers and expedients to be drawn up by diſcreet perſons, and *George Caſſander* was deſign'd to this great work, and did ſomething towards it: And *Emanuel Philibert*, D. of *Savoy* repenting of his warre undertaken for Religion againſt the *Pedemontans*, promiſed them Toleration, and was as good as his word: As much is done by the Nobility of *Polonia*. So that the beſt Princes and the beſt Biſhops gave Toleration and Impunities; but it is known that the firſt Perſecutions of diſagreeing perſons were by the *Arrians*, by the *Circumcellians* and *Donatiſts*, and from them, they of the Church took examples, who in ſmall numbers did ſometime perſwade it, ſometime practiſe it. And among the Greeks it became a publick and authorized practiſe, till the Queſtion of Images grew hot and high; for then the Worſhippers of Images having taken their example from the Empreſſe *Irene*, who put her Sonnes eyes out for making an Edict againſt Images, began to be as cruell as they were deceived, eſpecially being encouraged by the Popes of *Rome*, who then blew the coales to ſome purpoſe.

And that I may upon this occaſion give account

count of this affaire in the Church of *Rome*, it is remarkable that till the time of *Iuſtinian* the Emperour, *A. D.* 525. the Catholicks and *Novatians* had Churches indifferently permitted even in *Rome* it ſelfe, but the Biſhops of *Rome* whoſe intereſt was much concerned in it, ſpoke much againſt it, and laboured the eradication of the *Novatians*, and at laſt when they got power into their hands they ſerved them accordingly, but it is obſerved by *Socrates* that when the firſt Perſecution was made againſt them at *Rome* by Pope *Innocent* I, at the ſame inſtant the *Gothes* invaded *Italy*, and became Lords of all, it being juſt in God to bring a Perſecution upon them for true beliefe, who with an incompetent Authority and inſufficient grounds doe perſecute an errour leſſe materiall, in perſons agreeing with them in the profeſſion of the ſame common faith. And I have heard it obſerv'd as a bleſſing upon S. *Auſtin* (who was ſo mercifull to erring perſons as the greateſt part of his life in all ſenſes, even when he had twice chang'd his mind, yet to Tolerate them, and never to endure they ſhould be given over to the ſecular power to be kild) that the very night the *Vandals* ſet down before his City of *Hippo* to beſiege it, he dyed and went to God, being (as a reward of his mercifull Doctrine) taken from the miſeries to come, and yet that very thing was alſo a par-

cular iſſue of the Divine Providence upon that City, who not long before had altered their profeſſion into truth by force, and now were falling into their power, who afterward by a greater force turned them to be *Arrians*.

But in the Church of *Rome*, the Popes were the firſt Preachers of force and violence in matters of opinion, and that ſo zealouſly, that Pope *Vigilius* ſuffered himſelfe to be impriſoned and handled roughly by the Emperour *Iuſtinian*, rather then he would conſent to the reſtitution and peace of certain diſagreeing perſons, but as yet it came not ſo farre as death. The firſt that preached that Doctrine was *Dominick*, the Founder of the Begging Orders of Friers, the Friers Preachers; in memory of which the Inquiſition is intruſted only to the Friers of his Order; and if there be any force in dreams, or truth in Legends (as there is not much in either) this very thing might be ſignified by his Mothers dreame, who the night before *Dominick* was born, dream'd ſhe was brought to Bed of a huge Dog with a fire-brand in his mouth: Sure enough, however his diſciples expound the dreame, it was a better ſign that he ſhould prove a rabid, furious Incendiary, then any thing elſe; whatever he might be in the other parts of his life, in this Doctrine he was not much better, as appears in his deportment toward the *Albigenſes*, againſt whom hee ſo preached

preached, *adeo quidem ut centum hæreticorum millia ab octo millibus Catholicorum fuſa & interfecta fuiſſe perhibeantur*, ſaith one of him; and of thoſe who were taken, 180 were burnt to death, becauſe they would not abjure their Doctrine: This was the firſt example of putting erring perſons to death, that I find in the Roman Church; For about 170 years before, *Berengarius* fell into opinion concerning the bleſſed Sacrament which they cald Hereſy, and recanted, and relapſed, and recanted againe, and fell again two or three times, ſaith *Gerſon* writing againſt *Romant* of the *Roſe*, and yet he died *ſiccâ morte* his own naturall death, and with hope of Heaven, and yet *Hildebrand* was once his judge, which ſhewes that at that time *Rome* was not come to ſo great heigths of bloodſhed. In *England*, although the Pope had as great power here as any where, yet there were no Executions for matter of opinion known till the time of *Henry* the Fourth, who (becauſe he Uſurped the Crown) was willing by all means to endeare the Clergy by deſtroying their Enemies, that ſo he might be ſure of them to all his purpoſes. And indeed, it may become them well enough, who are wiſer in their generations then the children of light, it may poſſibly ſerve the pollicies of evill perſons, but never the pure and chaſte deſigns of Chriſtianity, which admits no blood but Chriſts, and the imitating

B. Bruno Berengarianos è ſuâ dioceſi expulit, non morti aut ſupplicijs corporalibus tradidit.

blood of Martyrs, but knowes nothing how to ſerve her ends, by perſecuting any of her erring children.

By this time I hope it will not be thought reaſonable to ſay, he that teaches mercy to erring perſons, teaches indifferency in Religion, unleſſe ſo many Fathers, and ſo many Churches, and the beſt of Emperours, and all the world (till they were abuſed by Tyranny, Popery, and Faction) did teach indifferency, for I have ſhewn that Chriſtianity does not puniſh corporally, perſons erring ſpiritually, but indeed Popery does; The *Donatiſts*, and *Circumcellians*, and *Arrians*, and the *Itaciani*, they of old did: In the middle Ages, the Patrons of Images did, and the Papiſts at this day doe, and have done ever ſince they were taught it by their S. *Dominick*.

Seventhly, And yet after all this, I have ſomething more to exempt my ſelfe from the clamour of this Objection: For let all errours be as much and as zealouſly ſuppreſſed as may be, (the Doctrine of the following Diſcourſe contradicts not that) but let it be done by ſuch meanes as are proper inſtruments of their ſuppreſſion, by Preaching and Diſputation (ſo that neither of them breed diſturbance) by charity and ſweetneſſe, by holineſſe of life, aſſiduity of exhortation, by the word of God and prayer.

For theſe wayes are moſt naturall, moſt prudent, moſt

moſt peaceable, and effectuall. Only let not men be haſty in calling every diſlik'd opinion by the name of Hereſy, and when they have reſolved, that they will call it ſo, let them uſe the erring perſon like a brother, not beat him like a dog, or convince him with a gibbet, or vex him out of his underſtanding and perſwaſions.

And now if men will ſtill ſay, I perſwade to indifferency, there is no help for me, for I have given reaſons againſt it, I muſt beare it as well as I can, I am not yet without remedy as they are, for patience will help me, and reaſon will not cure them, let them take their courſe, and Ile take mine:

I Only I will take leave to conſider this (and they would doe well to doe ſo too) that unleſſe Faith be kept within its own latitude, and not cald out to patrocinate every leſſe neceſſary opinion, and the intereſt of every Sect, or peeviſh perſon; and if damnation be pronounced againſt Chriſtians believing the Creed, and living good lives, becauſe they are deceived, or are ſaid to be deceived in ſome opinions leſſe neceſſary, there is no way in the world to ſatisfie unlearned perſons in the choice of their Religion, or to appeaſe the unquietneſſe of a ſcrupulous conſcience: For ſuppoſe an honeſt Citizen whoſe imployment and parts will not enable him to judge the diſputes and arguings

of great Clerks, ſees factions commenced and managed with much bitterneſſe by perſons who might on either hand be fit enough to guide him; when if he follows either, he is diſquieted and pronounced damned by the other (who alſo if he be the moſt unreaſonable in his opinion, will perhaps be more furious in his ſentence) what ſhall this man doe, where ſhall he reſt the ſole of his foot? Upon the Doctrine of the Church where he lives? Well! but that he heares declaimed againſt perpetually, and other Churches claime highly and pretend fairely for truth, and condemne his Church: If I tell him that he muſt live a good life, and believe the Creed, and not trouble himſelfe with their diſputes, or intereſting himſelfe in Sects and Factions, I ſpeak reaſon: Becauſe no law of God ties him to believe more then what is of eſſentiall neceſſity, and whatſoever he ſhall come to know to be reveal'd by God: Now if he believes his Creed, he believes all that is neceſſary to all, or of it ſelfe, and if he doe his morall endeavour beſide, he can doe no more toward finding out all the reſt, and then he is ſecured; but then if this will ſecure him, why doe men preſſe further and pretend every opinion as neceſſary, and that in ſo high degree that if they all ſaid true, or any two indeed of them, in 500 Sects which are in the world (and for ought I know there may be 5000) it is 500 to one

but

but that every man is damn'd, for every Sect damnes all but it ſelfe, and that is damn'd of 499, and it is excellent fortune then if that eſcape; and there is the ſame reaſon in every one of them, that is, it is extreme unreaſonableneſſe in all of them to pronounce damnation againſt ſuch perſons againſt whom clearely and dogmatically holy Scripture hath not; *In odioſis quod minimum eſt ſequimur, in favoribus quod eſt maximum*, ſaith the Law, and therefore we ſhould ſay any thing, or make any excuſe that is in any degree reaſonable, rather then condemn all the world to Hell, eſpecially if we conſider theſe two things, that we our ſelves are as apt to be deceived as any are, and that they who are deceived, when they uſed their morall induſtry that they might not be deceived, if they periſh for this, they periſh for what they could not help.

But however, if the beſt ſecurity in the world be not in neglecting all Sects, and ſubdiviſions of men, and fixing our ſelves on points neceſſary and plain, and on honeſt and pious endeavours, according to our ſeverall capacities and opportunities for all the reſt, if I ſay all this be not through the mercies of God, the beſt ſecurity to all unlearned perſons, and learned too, where ſhall we fix, where ſhall we either have peace or ſecurity? If you bid me follow your Doctrine, you muſt tell me why, and perhaps

haps when you have I am not able to judge, or if I be as able as other people are, yet when I have judged, I may be deceived too, and ſo may you, or any man elſe you bid me follow, ſo that I am no whit the nearer truth or peace.

And then if we look abroad, and conſider how there is ſcarce any Church, but is highly charg'd by many Adverſaries in many things, poſſibly we may ſee a reaſon to charge every one of them in ſome things; And what ſhall we do then? The Church of *Rome* hath ſpots enough, and all the world is inquiſitive enough to find out more, and to repreſent theſe to her greateſt diſadvantage. The Greek Church denies the proceſſion of the holy Ghoſt from the Son; If that be falſe Doctrine, ſhe is highly too blame, if it be not, then all the Weſtern Churches are too blame for ſaying the contrary: And there is no Church that is in proſperity, but alters her Doctrine every Age, either by bringing in new Doctrines, or by contradicting her old, which ſhewes that none are ſatisfied with themſelves, or with their own confeſſions: And ſince all Churches believe themſelves fallible, that only excepted which all other Churches ſay is moſt of all deceived, it were ſtrange if in ſo many Articles which make up their ſeverall bodies of Confeſſions, they had not miſtaken every one of them in ſomething or other: The *Lutheran* Churches maintaine Conſubſtantiation, the

Zuinglians

Zuinglians are Sacramentaries, the *Calviniſts* are fierce in the matters of abſolute Predetermination, and all theſe reject Epiſcopacy, which the Primitive Church would have made no doubt to have called Hereſy: The *Socinians* profeſſe a portentous number of ſtrange opinions; they deny the holy Trinity, and the ſatisfaction of our bleſſed Saviour: The *Anabaptiſts* laugh at Pædo-baptiſm; The *Ethiopian* Churches are *Neſtorian*: where then ſhall we fix our confidence, or joyn Communion? to pitch upon any one of theſe is to throw the dice, if ſalvation be to be had only in one of them, and that every errour that by chance hath made a Sect, and is diſtinguiſhed by a name, be damnable.

If this conſideration does not deceive me, we have no other help in the midſt of theſe diſtractions, and diſ-unions, but all of us to be united in that common terme, which as it does conſtitute the Church in its being ſuch, ſo it is the medium of the Communion of Saints, and that is the Creed of the Apoſtles, and in all other things an honeſt endeavour to find out * what truths we can, and a charitable and mutuall permiſſion to others that diſagree from us and our opinions. I am ſure this may ſatisfie us, for it will ſecure us, but I know not any thing elſe

* Clem. Alex. ſtromat. 1. ait Philoſophiam liberam eſſe præſtantiſſimam, quæ *ſcil.* verſatur in perſpicaciter ſeligendis dogmatis omnium Sectarum. Polamo Alexandrinus ſic primus philoſophatus eſt, ut ait Laërtius in Proëmio, unde cognominatus eſt, ἐκλεξάμενος, ſcil. τὰ ἀρέσαντα ἐξ ἑκάστης αἱρέσεως.

that will, and no man can be reaſonably perſwaded, or ſatisfied in any thing elſe, unleſſe he throwes himſelſe upon chance, or abſolute predeſtination, or his own confidence, in every one of which it is two to one at leaſt but he may miſcarry.

Thus farre I thought I had reaſon on my ſide, and I ſuppoſe I have made it good upon its proper grounds, in the pages following. But then if the reſult be, that men muſt be permitted in their opinions, and that Chriſtians muſt not Perſecute Chriſtians; I have alſo as much reaſon to reprove all thoſe oblique Arts which are not direct Perſecutions of mens perſons, but they are indirect proceedings, ungentle and unchriſtian, ſervants of faction and intereſt, provocations to zeal and animoſities, and deſtructive of learning and ingenuity. And theſe are ſuppreſſing all the monuments of their Adverſaries, forcing them to recant, and burning their Books.

For it is a ſtrange induſtry, and an importune diligence that was uſed by our fore-fathers; of all thoſe Hereſies which gave them battle and imployment, we have abſolutely no Record or Monument, but what themſelves who were Adverſaries have tranſmitted to us, and we know that Adverſaries, eſpecially ſuch who obſerv'd all opportunities to diſcredit both the perſons and doctrines of the Enemy, are not alwayes the

beſt

beſt records or witneſſes of ſuch tranſactions. We ſee it now in this very Age, in the preſent diſtemperatures, that parties are no good Regiſters of the actions of the adverſe ſide: And if we cannot be confident of the truth of a ſtory now, now I ſay that it is poſſible for any man, and likely that the intereſſed adverſary will diſcover the impoſture, it is farre more unlikely, that after Ages ſhould know any other truth, but ſuch as ſerves the ends of the repreſenters: I am ſure ſuch things were never taught us by Chriſt and his Apoſtles, and if we were ſure that our ſelves ſpoke truth, or that truth were able to juſtifie her ſelfe, it were better if to preſerve a Doctrine wee did not deſtroy a Commandement, and out of zeale pretending to Chriſtian Religion, looſe the glories and rewards of ingenuity and Chriſtian ſimplicity.

Of the ſame conſideration is mending of Authors, not to their own mind but to ours, that is, to mend them ſo as to ſpoile them; forbidding the publication of Books, in which there is nothing impious, or againſt the publick intereſt, leaving out clauſes in Tranſlations, diſgracing mens perſons, charging diſavowed Doctrins upon men, and the perſons of the men with the conſequents of their Doctrine, which they deny either to be true or to be conſequent, falſe reporting of Diſputations and Conferences, burning Books by the hand of the hang-man,

and all ſuch Arts, which ſhew that we either diſtruſt God for the maintenance of his truth, or that we diſtruſt the cauſe, or diſtruſt our ſelves and our abilities: I will ſay no more of theſe, but only concerning the laſt, I ſhall tranſcribe a paſſage out of *Tacitus* in the life of *Iulius Agricola*, who gives this account of it, *Veniam non petiſſem niſi incurſaturus tam ſæva & infeſta virtutibus tempora. Legimus cum Aruleno Ruſtico Pætus Thraſea, Herennio Senecioni Priſcus Helvidius laudati eſſent, capitale fuiſſe, neque in ipſos modo authores, ſed in libros quoque eorum ſævitum delegato Triumviris miniſterio ut monumenta clariſſimorum ingeniorum in comitio ac foro urerentur*, ſcil. *illo igne vocem populi Rom. & libertatem Senatus & conſcientiam generis humani aboleri arbitrabantur, expulſis inſuper ſapientiæ profeſſoribus, atque omni bonâ arte in exilium actâ, ne quid uſquam honeſtum occurreret.* It is but an illiterate Policy to think that ſuch indirect and uningenuous proceedings can amongſt wiſe and free-men diſgrace the Authors, and diſrepute their Diſcourſes; And I have ſeen that the price hath been trebled upon a forbidden or a condemn'd Book, and ſome men in policy have got a prohibition that their impreſſion might be the more certainly vendible, and the Author himſelfe thought conſiderable.

The beſt way is to leave tricks and devices, and to fall upon that way which the beſt Ages

of

of the Church did uſe : With the ſtrength of Argument, and Allegations of Scripture, and modeſty of deportment, and meekneſſe, and charity to the perſons of men, they converted miſbelievers, ſtopped the mouthes of Adverſaries, aſſerted truth, and diſcountenanced errour ; and thoſe other ſtratagems and Arts of ſupport and maintenance to Doctrines, were the iſſues of hereticall braines ; the old Catholicks had nothing to ſecure themſelves but the ἓν μέγα of truth and plaine dealing.

Fidem minutis diſſecant ambagibus
Ut quiſque linguâ eſt nequior.
Solvunt ligantque quæſtionum vincula
Per ſyllogiſmos plectiles.
Væ captioſis Sycophantarum ſtrophis,
Væ verſipelli aſtutiæ.
Nodos tenaces recta rumpit regula
Infeſta diſcertantibus :
Idcirco mundi ſtulta deligit Deus
Ut concidant Sophiſtica.

Prudent. apotheoſ. hym. in infidel.

And to my underſtanding, it is a plain Art and deſign of the Devill, to make us ſo in love with our own opinions, as to call them Faith and Religion, that we may be proud in our underſtanding ; and beſides, that by our zeale in our opinions, we grow coole in our piety and practicall duties, he alſo by this earneſt contention

does directly deſtroy good life, by engagement of Zealots to do any thing rather then be overcome, and looſe their beloved propoſitions: But I would faine know why is not any vitious habit as bad or worſe then a falſe opinion? Why are we ſo zealous againſt thoſe we call Hereticks, and yet great friends with drunkards, and fornicators, & ſwearers, and intemperate and idle perſons? Is it becauſe we are commanded by the Apoſtle to reject a Heretick after two admonitions, and not to bid ſuch a one God ſpeed? It is a good reaſon why we ſhould be zealous againſt ſuch perſons, provided we miſtake them not. For thoſe of whom theſe Apoſtles ſpeak, are ſuch as deny Chriſt to be come in the fleſh, ſuch as deny an Article of Creed; and in ſuch odious things, it is not ſafe nor charitable to extend the gravamen and puniſhment beyond the inſtances the Apoſtles make, or their exact parallels. But then alſo, it would be remembred that the Apoſtles ſpeak as fiercely againſt communion with fornicators, and all diſorders practicall, as againſt communion with Hereticks, *If any man that is called a brother be a Fornicator, or Covetous, or an Idolater, or a Railer, or a Drunkard, or an Extortioner, with ſuch a one no not to eat:* I am certain that a Drunkard is as contrary to God, and lives as contrary to the Lawes of Chriſtianity, as a Heretick; and I am alſo ſure that I know what drunkenneſſe is, but

I am not ſure that ſuch an opinion is Hereſy, neither would other men be ſo ſure as they think for if they did conſider it aright, and obſerve the infinite deceptions, and cauſes of deceptions in wiſe men, and in moſt things, and in all doubtfull Queſtions, and that they did not miſtake confidence for certainty.

But indeed, I could not but ſmile at thoſe jolly Fryers, two *Franciſcans* offered themſelves to the fire to prove *Savonarola* to be a Heretick, but a certaine *Iacobine* offered himſelfe to the fire to prove that *Savonarola* had true Revelations, and was no Heretick; in the meane time *Savonarola* preacht, but made no ſuch confident offer, nor durſt he venture at that new kind of fire Ordeal; and put caſe all four had paſt through the fire, and dyed in the flames, what would that have proved? Had he been a Heretick or no Heretick, the more or the leſſe, for the confidence of theſe Zealous Ideots? If we mark it, a great many Arguments whereon many Sects rely, are no better probation then this comes to. Confidence is the firſt, and the ſecond, and the third part of a very great many of their propoſitions. Commin. l. 8. c. 19.

But now if men would a little turn the Tables, and be as zealous for a good life, and all the ſtricteſt precepts of Chriſtianity (which is a Religion the moſt holy, the moſt reaſonable, and the moſt conſummate that ever was taught

to

to man) as they are for ſuch propoſitions in which neither the life, nor the ornament of Chriſtianity is concerned, we ſhould find, that as a conſequent of this piety, men would be as carefull as they could, to find out all truths, and the ſenſe of all revelations which may concern their duty; and where men were miſerable and could not, yet others that liv'd good lives too would alſo be ſo charitable, as not to adde affliction to this miſery; and both of them are parts of good life, to be compaſſionate, and to help to beare one anothers burdens, not to deſtroy the weak, but to entertain him meekly, that's a precept of charity, and to endeavour to find out the whole will of God, that alſo is a part of the obedience, the choyce and the excellency of Faith, and hee lives not a good life, that does not doe both theſe.

But men think they have more reaſon to bee zealous againſt Hereſy then againſt a vice in manners, becauſe Hereſy is infectious and dangerous, and the principle of much evill: Indeed if by a Hereſy we mean that which is againſt an Article of Creed, and breaks part of the Covenant made between God and man by the mediation of Jeſus Chriſt, I grant it to be a very grievous crime, a calling Gods veracity into queſtion, and a deſtruction alſo of good life, becauſe upon the Articles of Creed, obedience is built, and it lives or dies, as the effect does by its proper cauſe;

cauſe; for Faith is the morall cauſe of obedience: But then Hereſy, that is, ſuch as this, is alſo a vice, and the perſon criminall, and ſo the ſin is to be eſteem'd in its degrees of malignity, and let men be as zealous againſt it as they can, and imploy the whole arſenall of the ſpirituall armour againſt it, ſuch as this, is worſe then adultery or murther, in as much as the ſoule is more noble then the body, and a falſe doctrine is of greater diſſemination and extent then a ſingle act of violence or impurity. Adultery or murder is a duell, but Hereſy (truly and indeed ſuch) is an unlawfull warre, it ſlayes thouſands: The looſing of Faith is like digging down a foundation; all the ſuperſtructures of hope, and patience, and charity fall with it: And beſides this, Hereſy of all crimes is the moſt inexcuſable and of leaſt temptation; for true faith is moſt commonly kept with the leaſt trouble of any graee in the world; and Hereſy of it ſelfe hath not only no pleaſure in it, but is a very puniſhment; becauſe faith as it oppoſes hereticall or falſe opinions, and diſtinguiſhes from charity, conſiſts in meare acts of believing, which becauſe they are of true propoſitions, are naturall and proportionable to the underſtanding, and more honourable then falſe. But then concerning thoſe things which men now adayes call Hereſy, they cannot be ſo formidable as they are repreſented, and if we conſider that drunkenneſſe is

certainly a damnable ſin, and that there are more Drunkards then Heretick's, and that drunkenneſſe is parent of a thouſand vices, it may better bee ſaid of this vice then of moſt of thoſe opinions which we call Hereſies, it is infectious and dangerous, and the principle of much evill, and therefore as fit an object for a pious zeale to conteſt againſt, as is any of thoſe opinions which trouble mens eaſe or reputation, for that is the greateſt of their malignity.

But if we conſider that Sects are made and opinions are called Hereſies upon intereſt, and the grounds of emolument, we ſhall ſee that a good life would cure much of this miſchiefe. For firſt, the Church of *Rome* which is the great dictatrix of dogmaticall reſolutions, and the declarer of Hereſy, and calls Heretick more then all the world beſides, hath made that the rule of Hereſy, which is the conſervatory of intereſt, and the ends of men. For to recede from the Doctrine of the Church, with them makes Hereſy, that is, to diſrepute their Authority and not to obey them, not to be their ſubjects, not to give them the Empire of our conſcience, is the great κριτήριον of Hereſy.

So that with them, Hereſy is to be eſteemed clearely by humane ends, not by Divine Rules; that is formall Hereſy which does materially differve them, and it would make a ſuſpicious man a little inquiſitive into their par-

particular Doctrins, and when hee finds that Indulgences, and Jubilies, and Purgatories, and Maſſes, and Offices for the dead, are very profitable; that the Doctrine of primacy, of infallibility, of ſuperiority over Councels, of indirect power in temporals, are great inſtruments of ſecular honour; would be apt enough to think that if the Church of *Rome* would learn to lay her honour at the feet of the Crucifix, and deſpiſe the world, and preferre *Ieruſalem* before *Rome*, and Heaven above the Lateran, that theſe opinions would not have in them any native ſtrength to ſupport them, againſt the perpetuall aſſaults of their Adverſaries, that ſpeak ſo much reaſon and Scripture againſt them. I have inſtanced in the Roman Religion, but I wiſh it may be conſidered alſo how farre mens Doctrines in other Sects ſerve mens temporall ends, ſo farre that it would not bee unreaſonable or unneceſſary to attempt to cure ſome of their diſtemperatures or miſperſwaſions by the ſalutary precepts of ſanctity and holy life: Sure enough, if it did not more concern their reputation and their laſting intereſt to be counted true believers rather then good livers, they would rather endeavour to live well, then to bee accounted of a right opinion in things beſide the Creed.

For my own particular I cannot but expect, that God in his Juſtice ſhould enlarge the bounds of the Turkiſh Empire, or ſome other way puniſh

niſh Chriſtians by reaſon of their pertinacious diſputing about things unneceſſary, undeterminable, and unprofitable, and for their hating and perſecuting their brethren which ſhould be as dear to them as their own lives, for not conſenting to one anothers follies, and ſenſeleſſe vanities: How many volumnes have been writ about Angels, about immaculate conception, about originall ſin, when that all that is ſolid reaſon or clear Revelation, in all theſe three Articles, may be reaſonably enough comprized in fourty lines! And in theſe trifles and impertinencies, men are curiouſly buſie while they neglect thoſe glorious precepts of Chriſtianity and holy life, which are the glories of our Religion, and would enable us to a happy eternity.

My Lord, Thus farre my thoughts have carried me, and then I thought I had reaſon to goe further, and to examine the proper grounds upon which theſe perſwaſions might rely and ſtand firme, in caſe any body ſhould conteſt againſt them: For poſſibly men may be angry at me and my deſign; for I doe all them great diſpleaſure, who think no end is then well ſerved, when their intereſt is diſſerved; and but that I have writ ſo untowardly and heavily, that I am not worth a confutation, poſſibly ſome or other might be writing againſt me. But then I muſt tell them I am prepared of an anſwer before hand: For I think I have ſpoken reaſon in my Book,

Book, and examined it with all the ſeverity I have, and if after all this I be deceiv'd, this confirms me in my firſt opinion, and becomes a new Argument to me, that I have ſpoken reaſon; for it furniſhes me with a new inſtance, that it is neceſſary, there ſhould bee a mutuall complyance and Toleration, becauſe even then when a man thinks he hath moſt reaſon to bee confident, hee may eaſily bee deceived.

For I am ſure, I have no other deſign but the proſecution and advantage of truth, and I may truly uſe the words of *Gregory Nazianzen*, *Non ſtudemus paci in detrimentum veræ doctrinæ, ... ut facilitatis & manſuetudinis famam colligamus:* But I have writ this becauſe I thought it was neceſſary and ſeaſonable, and charitable, and agreeable to the great precepts and deſign of Chriſtianity, conſonant to the practiſe of the Apoſtles, and of the beſt Ages of the Church, moſt agreeable to Scripture and reaſon, to revelation and the nature of the thing; and it is ſuch a Doctrine, that if there be variety in humane affaires, if the event of things be not ſettled in a durable conſiſtence, but is changeable, every one of us all may have need of it: I ſhall only therefore deſire that they who will reade it may come to the reading it with as much ſimplicity of purpoſes and unmixed deſires of truth, as I did to the writing it, and that no man trouble himſelfe with me or my diſcourſe, that thinks before hand that his opinion cannot be reaſonably altered. If he thinks me to be miſtaken before he tries, let

him alſo think that hee may be miſtaken too, and that he who judges before he heares, is miſtaken though he gives a right ſentence:

Ariſtoph. in Pluto. Οὐ χαλιάζειν χὴ βοᾷν πρὶν ἂν μάθῃς,

Was good counſell: But at a venture, I ſhall leave this ſentence of *Solomon* to his conſideration, *A wiſe man feareth, and departeth from evill, but a foole rageth and is confident,* Πάντα εἰδέναι ὀιεσθ χὴ διϊσχυρίζεσθ, is a trick of boyes and bold young fellowes, ſayes *Ariſtotle*; but they who either know themſelves, or things, or perſons, ὑποπτεύειν ἀεὶ τὸ ἴσως, χὴ τὸ τάχα. Peradventure yea, peradventure no, is very often the wiſeſt determination of a Queſtion: For there

2 Tim. 2. are μωρὰς χὴ ἀπαιδεύτους ζητήσεις (as the Apoſtle notes) fooliſh and unlearned Queſtions, and it were better to ſtop the current of ſuch fopperies by ſilence, then by diſputing them convey them to Poſterity. And many things there are of more profit which yet are of no more certainty, and therefore boldneſſe of aſſertion (except it be in matters of Faith and cleareſt Revelation) is an Argument of the vanity of the man, never of the truth of the propoſition; for to ſuch matters the ſaying of *Xenophanes* in *Varro*, is pertinent and applicable, *Hominis eſt hæc opinari, Dei ſcire*; God only knowes them, and we conjecture.

Μάλιστ ἄριστ ὅστις εἰκάζει καλῶς.

And although I be as deſirous to know what I ſhould, and what I ſhould not, as any of my Brethren the Sons of *Adam*; yet I find that the more I ſearch, the further I am from being ſatisfied, and make but

few

few diſcoveries, ſave of my own ignorance, and therefore I am deſirous to follow the example of a very wiſe Perſonage, *Iulius Agricola*, of whom *Tacitus* gave this teſtimony, *Retinuitque (quod eſt difficillimum) ex ſcientiâ modum*; or that I may take my precedent from within the pale of the Church, it was the ſaying of S. *Auſtin*, *Mallem quidem eorum quæ à me quæſiviſti habere ſcientiam quam ignorantiam, ſed quia id nondum potui, magis eligo cautam ignorantiam confiteri, quam falſam ſcientiam profiteri*; And theſe words doe very much expreſſe my ſenſe. But if there be any man ſo confident as *Luther* ſometimes was, who ſaid that hee could expound all Scripture, or ſo vaine as *Eckius* who in his *Chryſopaſſus* ventur'd upon the higheſt and moſt myſterious Queſtion of Predeſtination, *ut in eâ juveniles poſſit calores exercere*; ſuch perſons as theſe, or any that is furious in his opinion, will ſcorn me and my Diſcourſe; but I ſhall not bee much mov'd at it, only I ſhall wiſh that I had as much knowledge as they think me to want, and they as much as they believe themſelves to have. In the meane time, Modeſty were better for us both, and indeed for all men: For when men indeed are knowing, amongſt other things they are able to ſeparate certainties from uncertainties; If they be not knowing, it is pity that their ignorance ſhould bee triumphant, or diſcompoſe the publike peace, or private confidence.

And now (my Lord) that I have inſcrib'd this Book to your Lordſhip, although it be a deſign of doing

doing honour to my ſelfe, that I have markt it with ſo honour'd and beloved a Name, might poſſibly need as much excuſe as it does pardon, but that your Lordſhip knowes your own; for out of your Mines I have digg'd the Minerall; only I have ſtampt it with my own image, as you may perceive by the deformities which are in it. But your great Name in letters will adde ſo much value to it, as to make it obtaine its pardon amongſt all them that know how to value you, and all your relatives and dependants by the proportion of relation. For others I ſhall be incurious, becauſe the number of them that honour you is the ſame with them that honour Learning and Piety, and they are the beſt Theatre and the beſt judges; amongſt which the world muſt needs take notice of my ambition, to be aſcribed by my publike pretence to be what I am in all heartineſſe of Devotion, and for all the reaſon of the world,

My Honour'd Lord,

Your Lordſhips moſt faithfull

and moſt affectionate ſervant,

J. TAYLOR.

The Contents of the Sections.

Section I.

Of the Nature of Faith, and that its duty is compleated in believing the Articles of the Apoſtles Creed. Pag. 5.

Sect. II.

Of Hereſy and the nature of it, and that it is to be accounted according to the ſtrict capacity of Chriſtian Faith, and not in Opinions ſpeculative, nor ever to pious perſons. pag. 18.

Sect. III.

Of the difficulty and uncertainty of Arguments from Scripture, in Queſtions not ſimply neceſſary, not literally determined. pag. 59.

Sect. IV.

Of the difficulty of Expounding Scripture. pag. 73.

Sect. V.

Of the inſufficiency and uncertainty of Tradition to expound

expound Scripture, or determine Questions. pag. 83.

SECT. VI.

Of the uncertainty and insufficiency of Councels Ecclesiasticall to the same purpose. pag. 101.

SECT. VII.

Of the fallibility of the Pope, and the uncertainty of his Expounding Scripture, and resolving Questions. pag. 125.

SECT. VIII.

Of the disability of Fathers, or Writers Ecclesiasticall, to determine our Questions, with certainty and Truth. pag. 151.

SECT. IX.

Of the incompetency of the Church in its diffusive capacity to be Iudge of Controversies, and the impertinency of that pretence of the Spirit. pag. 161.

SECT. X.

Of the authority of Reason, and that it, proceeding upon the best grounds, is the best judge. pag. 165.

SECT. XI.

Of some causes of Errour in the exercise of Reason, which are inculpate in themselves. pag. 171.

SECT. XII.

Of the innocency of Errour in opinion in a pious person. pag. 184.

SECT.

SECT. XIII.

Of the deportment to be used towards persons disagreeing, and the reasons why they are not to be punished with death, &c. pag.189.

SECT. XIIII.

Of the practice of Christian Churches towards persons disagreeing, and when Persecution first came in. pag.203.

SECT. XV.

How farre the Church or Governours may act to the restraining false or differing opinions. pag.210.

SECT. XVI.

whether it be lawfull for a Prince to give toleration to severall Religions. pag.213.

SECT. XVII.

Of compliance with disagreeing persons, or weak Consciences in generall. pag.217.

SECT. XVIII.

A particular consideration of the Opinions of the Anabaptists. pag.223

SECT. XIX.

That there may be no Toleration of Doctrines inconsistent with piety or the publique good. pag.246.

SECT. XX.

How farre the Religion of the Church of Rome *is Tolerable.* pag. 249.

SECT. XXI.

Of the duty of particular Churches in allowing Communion. pag. 262.

SECT. XXII.

That particular men may communicate with Churches of different perſwaſions, and how farre they may doe it. pag. 264.

OF

Θεολογία Ἐκλεκτική.

OF THE LIBERTY OF PROPHESYING.

THE infinite variety of Opinions in matters of Religion, as they have troubled Christendome, with interests, factions, and partialities; so have they caused great divisions of the heart, and variety of thoughts and designes amongst pious and prudent men. For they all seeing the inconveniences which the dis-union of perswasions and Opinions have produced directly or accidentally, have thought themselves obliged to stop this inundation of mischieses, and have made attempts accordingly. But it hath hapned to most of them as to a mistaken Physitian, who gives excellent physick but mis-applies it, and so misses of his cure; so have these men, their attempts have therefore been ineffectuall; for they put their help to a wrong part, or they have endeavoured to cure the symptomes, and have let the disease alone till it seem'd incurable. Some have endeavoured to re-unite these

fractions by propounding ſuch a Guide which they were all bound to follow; hoping that the Unity of a Guide, would have perſwaded unity of mindes; but who this Guide ſhould be at laſt became ſuch a Queſtion, that it was made part of the fire that was to be quenched; ſo farre was it from extinguiſhing any part of the flame. Others thought of a Rule, and this muſt be the meanes of Union, or nothing could doe it. But ſuppoſing all the World had been agreed of this Rule, yet the interpretation of it was ſo full of variety, that this alſo became part of the diſeaſe, for which the cure was pretended. All men reſolv'd upon this, that though they yet had not hit upon the right, yet ſome way muſt be thought upon to reconcile differences in Opinion, thinking ſo long as this variety ſhould laſt, Chriſt's Kingdome was not advanced, and the work of the Goſpel went on but ſlowly: Few men in the mean time conſidered, that ſo long as men had ſuch variety of principles, ſuch ſeverall conſtitutions, educations, tempers, and diſtempers, hopes, intereſts and weaknesſes, degrees of light, and degrees of underſtanding, it was impoſſible all ſhould be of one minde. And what is impoſſible to be done, is not neceſſary it ſhould be done: And therefore, although variety of Opinions was impoſſible to be cured (and they who attempted it, did like him who claps his ſhoulder to the ground to ſtop an earth-quake) yet the inconveniences ariſing from it might poſſibly be cured, not by uniting their beliefes, that was to be diſpaird of, but by curing that which cauſ'd theſe miſchiefes, and accidentall inconveniences of their diſagreeings. For although theſe inconveniences which every man ſees and feeles were conſequent to this diverſity of perſwaſions, yet it was but accidentally and by chance, in as much as wee ſee that in many things, and they of great concernment, men alow to themſelves and to each other a liberty of diſagreeing, and no hurt neither. And certainely if diverſity of Opinions, were of it ſelfe the cauſe of miſchiefes it would be ſo ever, that is, regularly and univerſally (but that we ſee it is not:) For there are diſputes in Chriſtendome concerning matters of greater concernment then moſt of thoſe Opinions that diſtinguiſh Sects, and make factions; and yet becauſe men are permitted to differ in thoſe great matters, ſuch evills are not conſequent to

ſuch

such differences, as are to the uncharitable managing of smaller and more inconsiderable Questions. It is of greater consequence to believe right in the Question of the validity or invalidity of a death-bed repentance, then to believe aright in the Question of Purgatory; and the consequences of the Doctrine of Predetermination, are of deeper and more materiall consideration then the products of the beliefe of the lawfulnesse or unlawfulnesse of private Masses; and yet these great concernments where a liberty of Prophecying in these Questions hath been permitted, hath made no distinct Communion, no sects of Christians, and the others have, and so have these too in those places where they have peremptorily been determind on either side. Since then if men are quiet and charitable in some dis-agreeings, that then and there the inconvenience ceases, if they were so in all others where lawfully they might (and they may in most,) Christendome should be no longer rent in pieces, but would be redintegrated in a new Pentecost, and although the Spirit of God did rest upon us in divided tongues, yet so long as those tongues were of fire not to kindle strife, but to warme our affections, and inflame our charities, we should finde that this variety of Opinions in severall persons would be look't upon as an argument only of diversity of operations, while the Spirit is the same; and that another man believes not so well as I, is onely an argument that I have a better and a clearer illumination than he, that I have a better gift than he, received a speciall grace and favour, and excell him in this, and am perhaps excelled by him in many more. And if we all impartially endeavour to finde a truth, since this endeavour and search only is in our power, that wee shall finde it being *ab extra*, a gift and an assistance extrinsecall, I can see no reason why this pious endeavour to finde out truth shall not be of more force to unite us in the bonds of charity, then his misery in missing it shall be to dis-unite us. So that since a union of perswasion is impossible to be attain'd, if we would attempt the cure by such remedies as are apt to enkindle and encrease charity, I am confident wee might see a blessed peace would bee the reward and crown of such endeavours.

But men are now adayes and indeed alwayes have been, since

the expiration of the first blessed Ages of Christianity, so in love with their own Fancies and Opinions, as to think Faith and all Christendome is concernd in their support and maintenance, and whoever is not so fond and does not dandle them like themselves, it growes up to a quarrell, which because it is in *materiâ theologiæ* is made a quarrell in Religion, and God is entitled to it; and then if you are once thought an enemy to God, it is our duty to persecute you even to death, we doe God good service in it; when if we should examine the matter rightly, the Question is either in *materiâ non revelata*, or *minus evidenti*, or *non necessariâ*, either it is not revealed, or not so clearely; but that wise and honest men may be of different minds, or else it is not of the foundation of faith, but a remote super-structure, or else of meere speculation, or perhaps when all comes to all, it is a false Opinion, or a matter of humane interest, that we have so zealously contended for; for to one of these heads most of the Disputes of Christendome may be reduc'd; so that I believe the present fractions (or the most) are from the same cause which St *Paul* observed in the *Corinthian* Schisme, *when there are divisions among you, are ye not carnall?* It is not the differing Opinions that is the cause of the present ruptures, but want of charity; it is not the variety of understandings, but the disunion of wills and affections; it is not the severall principles, but the severall ends that cause our miseries: our Opinions commence, and are upheld according as our turns are serv'd and our interests are preserv'd, and there is no cure for us, but Piety and Charity. A holy life will make our belief holy, if we consult not humanity and its imperfections in the choyce of our Religion, but search for truth without designes, save only of acquiring heaven, and then be as carefull to preserve Charity, as we were to get a point of Faith; I am much perswaded we should finde out more truths by this meanes; or however (which is the maine of all) we shall be secured though we misse them; and then we are well enough.

For if it be evinced that one heaven shall hold men of severall Opinions, if the unity of Faith be not destroyed by that which men call differing Religions, and if an unity of Charity be the duty of us all even towards persons that are not perswaded

ded of every propoſition we believe, then I would faine know to what purpoſe are all thoſe ſtirres, and great noyſes in Chriſtendome; thoſe names of faction, the ſeverall Names of Churches not diſtinguiſh'd by the diviſion of Kingdomes, *ut Eccleſia ſequatur Imperium*, which was the Primitive Rule and Canon, but diſtinguiſh'd by Names of Sects and men; theſe are all become inſtruments of hatred, thence come Schiſmes and parting of Communions, and then perſecutions, and then warres and Rebellion, and then the diſſolutions of all Friendſhips and Societies. All theſe miſchiefes proceed not from this, that all men are not of one minde, for that is neither neceſſary nor poſſible, but that every Opinion is made an Article of Faith, every Article is a ground of a quarrell, every quarrell makes a faction, every faction is zealous, and all zeale pretends for God, and whatſoever is for God cannot be too much; we by this time are come to that paſſe, we think we love not God except we hate our Brother, and we have not the vertue of Religion, unleſſe we perſecute all Religions but our own; for luke-warmneſſe is ſo odious to God and Man, that we proceeding furiouſly upon theſe miſtakes, by ſuppoſing we preſerve the body, we deſtroy the ſoule of Religion, or by being zealous for faith, or which is all one, for that which we miſtake for faith, we are cold in charity, and ſo looſe the reward of both.

* *Optat. lib. 3.*

All theſe errors and miſchiefes muſt be diſcovered and cured, and that's the purpoſe of this Diſcourſe.

SECTION I.

Of the nature of Faith, and that its duty is compleated in believing the Articles of the Apoſtles Creed.

Number 8.

FIrſt then it is of great concernment to know the nature and integrity of faith: For there begins our firſt and great miſtake; for Faith although it be of great excellency, yet when it is taken for a habit intellectuall, it hath ſo little roome and ſo narrow a capacity, that it cannot lodge thouſands of thoſe Opinions which pretend to be of her Family.

Numb. 2. For although it be necessary for us to believe whatsoever we know to be revealed of God, and so every man does, that believes there is a God: yet it is not necessary, concerning many things, to know that God hath revealed them, that is, we may be ignorant of, or doubt concerning the propositions, and indifferently maintaine either part, when the Question is not concerning Gods veracity, but whether God hath said so or no: That which is of the foundation of Faith, that only is necessary; and the knowing or not knowing of that, the believing or dis-believing it, is that only which in *genere credendorum*, is in immediate and necessary order to salvation or damnation.

Numb. 3. Now all the reason and demonstration of the world convinces us, that this foundation of Faith, or the great adequate object of the Faith that saves us, is that great mysteriousnesse of Christianity which Christ taught with so much diligence, for the credibility of which he wrought so many miracles; for the testimony of which the Apostles endured persecutions; that which was a folly to the Gentiles, and a scandall to the Jewes, this is that which is the object of a Christians Faith: All other things are implicitely in the beliefe of the Articles of Gods veracity, and are not necessary in respect of the Constitution of faith to be drawn out, but may there lie in the bowels of the great Articles without danger to any thing or any person, unlesse some other accident or circumstance makes them necessary: Now the great object which I speak of, is *Jesus Christ crucified; Constitui enim apud vos nihil scire præter Jesum Christum & hunc crucifixum*; so said S. *Paul* to the Church of *Corinth*: This is the Article upon the Confession of which Christ built his Church, *viz.* only upon S. *Peters* Creed, which was no more
Mat. 16. 19. but this simple enunciation, *We believe and are sure that thou art Christ, the Sonne of the living God*: And to this salvation particularly is promised, as in the case of *Martha*'s Creed, *Joh.* 11. 27. To this the Scripture gives the greatest Testimony,
1 Joh. 4. 2, 15. and to all them that confesse it; *For every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God: And who ever confesseth that Jesus Christ is the Sonne of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God*: The believing this Article is the end of writing

writing the foure Goſpels: *For all theſe things are written, that ye might believe, that Ieſus is the Chriſt the Sonne of God,* and then that this is ſufficient followes, and that *believing,* viz. this Article (for this was only inſtanced in) *yee might have life through his name:* This is that great Article which in *genere credendorum,* is ſufficient diſpoſition to prepare a *Catechumen* to Baptiſm, as appeares in the caſe of the *Ethiopian* Eunuch, whoſe Creed was only this, *I believe that Ieſus Chriſt is the Sonne of God,* and upon this Confeſſion (ſaith the ſtory) they both went into the water, and the *Ethiop* was waſhed and became as white as ſnow. Ioh.20.31.

In theſe particular inſtances, there is no variety of Articles, ſave only that in the annexes of the ſeverall expreſſions, ſuch things are expreſſed, as beſides that Chriſt is come, they tell from whence, and to what purpoſe: And whatſoever is expreſſed, or is to theſe purpoſes implyed, is made articulate and explicate, in the ſhort and admirable myſterious Creed of S. *Paul, Rom.*10.8. *This is the word of faith which we preach, that if thou ſhalt confeſſe with thy mouth the Lord Ieſus, and ſhalt believe in thine heart, that God hath raiſed him from the dead, thou ſhalt bee ſaved:* This is the great and intire complexion of a Chriſtian's faith, and ſince ſalvation is promiſed to the beliefe of this Creed, either a ſnare is laid for us, with a purpoſe to deceive us, or elſe nothing is of prime and originall neceſſity to be believed, but this, *Ieſus Chriſt our Redeemer*; and all that which is the neceſſary parts, meanes, or maine actions of working this redemption for us, and the honour for him is in the bowels and fold of the great Article, and claims an explicite belief by the ſame reaſon that binds us to the belief of its firſt complexion, without which neither the thing could be acted, nor the propoſition underſtood. *Numb.*4.

For the act of believing propoſitions, is not for it ſelfe, but in order to certaine ends; as Sermons are to good life and obedience; for (excepting that it acknowledges Gods veracity, and ſo is a direct act of Religion) believing a revealed propoſition, hath no excellency in it ſelfe, but in order to that end for which we are inſtructed in ſuch revelations. Now Gods great purpoſe being to bring us to him by Jeſus Chriſt, *Numb.*5.

Chriſt

Christ is our medium to God, obedience is the medium to Christ, and Faith the medium to obedience, and therefore is to have its estimate in proportion to its proper end, and those things are necessary, which necessarily promote the end, without which obedience cannot be encouraged or prudently enjoyn'd: So that those Articles are necessary, that is, those are fundamentall points, upon which we build our obedience; and as the influence of the Article is to the perswasion or engagement of obedience, so they have their degrees of necessity. Now all that Christ, when he preach'd, taught us to believe, and all that the Apostles in their Sermons propound, all aime at this, that wee should acknowledge Christ for our Law-Giver and our Saviour; so that nothing can be necessary by a prime necessity to be believ'd explicitely, but such things which are therefore parts of the great Article, because they either encourage our services, or oblige them, such as declare Christs greatnesse in himselfe, or his goodnesse to us: So that although we must neither deny nor doubt of any thing, which we know our great Master hath taught us: yet salvation is in speciall and by name annexed to the beliefe of those Articles only, which have in them the indearements of our services, or the support of our confidence, or the satisfaction of our hopes, such as are; Jesus Christ the Sonne of the living God, the Crucifixion and Resurrection of Iesus, forgivenesse of sinnes by his blood, Resurrection of the dead, and life eternall, because these propositions qualifie Christ for our Saviour and our Law-Giver, the one to engage our services, the other to endeare them; for so much is necessary as will make us to be his servants, and his Disciples; and what can be required more? This only. Salvation is promis'd to the explicite belief of those Articles, and therefore those only are necessary, and those are sufficient; but thus, to us in the formality of Christians, which is a formality super-added to a former capacity, we before we are Christians are reasonable creatures, and capable of a blessed eternity, and there is a Creed which is the Gentiles Creed which is so supposed in the Christian Creed, as it is supposed in a Christian to be a man, and that is, *oportet accedentem ad Deum credere Deum esse, & esse remuneratorem quærentium eum.*

If

If any man will urge farther, that whatsoever is deducible from these Articles by necessary consequence, is necessary to be believed explicitely: I Answer. It is true, if he sees the deduction and coherence of the parts; but it is not certain that every man shall be able to deduce whatsoever is either immediately, or certainly deducible from these premises; and then since salvation is promis'd to the explicite belief of these, I see not how any man can justifie the making the way to heaven narrower then Jesus Christ hath made it, it being already so narrow, that there are few that finde it.

In the pursuance of this great truth, the Apostles or the holy men, their Contemporaries and Disciples, composed a Creed to be a Rule of Faith to all Christians, as appears in *Irenæus*, [a] *Tertullian*, [b] *S. Cyprian*, [c] *S. Austin*, [d] *Ruffinus*, and divers [e] others; which Creed unlesse it had contain'd all the intire object of Faith, and the foundation of Religion, it cannot be imagin'd to what purpose it should serve; and that it was so esteem'd by the whole Church of God in all Ages, appears in this, that since Faith is a necessary pre-disposition to Baptism in all persons capable of the use of reason, all *Catechumens* in the Latine Church comming to Baptism, were interrogated concerning their Faith, and gave satisfaction in the recitation of this Creed. And in the East they professed exactly the same Faith, something differing in words, but of the same matter, reason, design, and consequence; and so they did at *Hierusalem*, so at *Aquileia*: This was that ὅρον τῆς ἁμώμητου πίστεως, ὑπερ κηρύττει ἡ ἁγία τοῦ θεοῦ καθολικὴ καὶ ἀποστολικὴ ἐκκλησία καὶ ἑξῆς τρόπον καινισμὸν δεξαμένη. These Articles were τὰ ἐξ ἀγίων ἀποστόλων καὶ τῶν μετ' ἐκείνων διαρριφέντων ἐν ταῖς ἁγίαις θεοῦ ἐκκλησίαις διδάγματα. *L. 5. Cod. de S. Trinit. & fid. Cath. Cum recta.* Now since the Apostles and Apostolicall men and Churches in these their Symbols, did recite particular Articles to a considerable number, and were so minute in their recitation, as to descend to circumstances, it is more then probable that they omitted nothing of necessity; and that these Articles are not generall principles, in the bosome of which many more Articles equally necessary to be believed explicitely and more particular, are infolded; but that it is as minute an explication of those *prima credibilia*

Numb. 7.

[a] Apol. contr. Gent. c. 47. de veland. virg. c. 1.

[b] In expos. Symbol.

[c] Serm. 5. de tempore, cap. 2.

[d] In Symbol. apud Cyprian.

[e] Omnes orthodoxi Patres affirmant Symbolum ab ipsis Apostolis conditum, *Sext. Senensis, lib. 2. bibl. 5. vide Genebr. l. 3. de Trin.*

I before reckoned, as is necessary to salvation.

Numb. 8. And therefore *Tertullian* calls the Creed *regulam fidei, quâ salvâ & formâ ejus manente in suo ordine, possit in Scriptura tractari & inquiri si quid videtur vel ambiguitate pendere vel obscuritate obumbrari. Cordis signaculum & nostræ militiæ Sacramentum,* S. *Ambrose* calls it, *lib.* 3. *de velandis virgin. Comprehensio fidei nostræ atq; perfectio,* by S. *Austin,* Serm. 115. *Confessio, expositio, regula fidei,* generally by the Ancients: The profession of this Creed, was the exposition of that saying of S. *Peter,* συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς ἐπερώτημα εἰς Θεὸν, *The answer of a good conscience towards God.* For of the recitation and profession of this Creed in Baptism, it is that *Tertullian de resur. carnis* sayes, *Anima non lotione, sed responsione sancitur.* And of this was the prayer of *Hillary, lib.* 12. *de Trinit. Conserva hanc conscientiæ meæ vocem ut quod in regenerationis meæ Symbolo Baptizatus in Patre, Filio, Spir. S. professus sum semper obtineam.* And according to the Rule and Reason of this Discourse (that it may appear that the Creed hath in it all Articles *primò & per se,* primely and universally necessary) the Creed is just such an explication of that Faith which the Apostles preached, *viz.* the Creed which S. *Paul* recites, as containes in it all those things which entitle Christ to us in the capacities of our Law-Giver and our Saviour, such as enable him to the great work of redemption, according to the predictions concerning him, and such as engage and encourage our services. For, taking out the Article of Christs descent into Hell (which was not in the old Creed, as appeares in some of the Copies I before referd to, in *Tertullian, Ruffinus,* and *Irenæus*; and indeed was omitted in all the Confessions of the Eastern Churches, in the Church of *Rome*, and in the *Nicene* Creed, which by adoption came to be the Creed of the Catholike Church) all other Articles are such as directly constitute the parts and work of our redemption, such as clearly derive the honour to Christ, and enable him with the capacities of our Saviour and Lord. The rest engage our services by proposition of such Articles which are rather promises then propositions; and the whole Creed, take it in any of the old Forms, is but an Analysis of that which S. *Paul* cals the word of salvation, whereby we shall be saved, *viz.* that we confesse

confesse Jesus to be Lord, and that God raised him from the dead: by the first whereof he became our Law-Giver and our Guardian; by the second he was our Saviour: the other things are but parts and maine actions of those two. Now what reason there is in the world that can inwrap any thing else within the foundation, that is, in the whole body of Articles simply and inseparably necessary, or in the prime originall necessity of Faith, I cannot possibly imagine. These doe the work, and therefore nothing can upon the true grounds of reason enlarge the necessity to the inclosure of other Articles.

Numb. 9. Now if more were necessary than the Articles of the Creed, I demand why was it made the * Characteristick note of a Christian from a Heretick, or a Jew, or an Infidell? or to what purpose was it composed? Or if this was intended as sufficient, did the Apostles or those Churches which they founded, know any thing else to be necessary? If they did not, then either nothing more is necessary (I speak of matters of meer belieſe) or they did not know all the will of the Lord, and so were unfit Dispensers of the mysteries of the Kingdom; or if they did know more was necessary, and yet would not insert it, they did an act of publike notice, and consign'd it to all Ages of the Church to no purpose, unless to beguile credulous people by making them believe their faith was sufficient, having tryed it by that touch-stone Apostolicall, when there was no such matter.

* Vide Isidor. de Eccles. offic. lib. 1. cap. 20. Suidan. Turnebum. lib. 2. c. 30. adverſ. Venant. Fortun. in Exeg. Symb. Feuardent. in Iren. lib. 1. c. 2.

Numb. 10. But if this was sufficient to bring men to heaven then, why not now? If the Apostles admitted all to their Communion that believed this Creed, why shall wee exclude any that preserve the same intire? why is not our faith of these Articles of as much efficacy for bringing us to heaven, as it was in the Churches Apostolicall? who had guides more infallible that might without errour have taught them superstructures enough, if they had been necessary: and so they did; But that they did not insert them into the Creed, when they might have done it with as much certainty, as these Articles, makes it clear to my understanding, that other things were not necessary, but these were; that whatever profit and advantages might come from other Articles, yet these were sufficient, and however certain

perſons might accidentally be obliged to believe much more, yet this was the one and onely foundation of Faith upon which all perſons were to build their hopes of heaven; this was therefore neceſſary to be taught to all, becauſe of neceſſity to be believ'd by all: So that although other perſons might commit a delinquency *in genere morum*, if they did not know or did not believe much more, becauſe they were oblig'd to further diſquiſitions in order to other ends, yet none of theſe who held the Creed intire, could periſh for want of neceſſary faith, though poſſibly he might for ſupine negligence or affected ignorance, or ſome other fault which had influence upon his opinions, and his underſtanding, he having a new ſupervening obligation *ex accidente* to know and believe more.

Numb. II. Neither are we oblig'd to make theſe Articles more particular and minute then the Creed. For ſince the Apoſtles and indeed our bleſſed Lord himſelfe promiſed heaven to them who believd him to be the Chriſt that was to come into the world, and that he who believes in him, ſhould be partaker of the reſurrection and life eternall, he will be as good as his word: yet becauſe this Article was very generall, and a complexion rather then a ſingle propoſition; the Apoſtles and others our Fathers in Chriſt did make it more explicite, and though they have ſaid no more then what lay entire and ready form'd in the boſome of the great Article, yet they made their extracts, to great purpoſe, and abſolute ſufficiency, and therefore there needs no more deductions or remoter conſequences from the firſt great Article, than the Creed of the Apoſtles. For although whatſoever is certainly deduced from any of theſe Articles made already ſo explicite, is as certainly true, and as much to be believed as the Article it ſelfe, becauſe *ex veris poſſunt nil niſi vera ſequi*, yet becauſe it is not certain that our deductions from them are certain, and what one calls evident, is ſo obſcure to another, that he believes it falſe; it is the beſt and only ſafe courſe to reſt in that explication the Apoſtles have made, becauſe if any of theſe Apoſtolicall deductions were not demonſtrable evidently to follow from that great Article to which ſalvation is promiſed, yet the authority of them who compil'd the Symboll, the plaine deſcription of the Articles from the words

words of Scriptures, the evidence of reaſon demonſtrating theſe to be the whole foundation, are ſufficient upon great grounds of reaſon to aſcertaine us; but if we goe farther, beſides the eaſineſſe of being deceived, we relying upon our own diſcourſes, (which though they may be true and then binde us to follow them, but yet no more then when they only ſeem trueſt,) yet they cannot make the thing certaine to another, much leſſe neceſſary in it ſelfe. And ſince God would not binde us upon paine of ſinne and puniſhment, to make deductions our ſelves; much leſſe would he binde us to follow another man's Logick as an Article of our Faith; I ſay much leſſe another mans; for our own integrity (for we will certainly be true to our ſelves, and doe our own buſineſſe heartily) is as fit and proper to be imployed as another mans ability. He cannot ſecure me that his ability is abſolute and the greateſt, but I can be more certaine that my own purpoſes and fidelity to my ſelfe is ſuch. And ſince it is neceſſary to reſt ſomewhere, leſt we ſhould run to an infinity, it is beſt to reſt there where the Apoſtles and the Churches Apoſtolicall reſted; when not only they who are able to judge, but others who are not, are equally aſcertained of the certainty and of the ſufficiency of that explication.

This I ſay, not that I believe it unlawfull or unſafe for the Church or any of the *Antiſtites religionis*, or any wiſe man to extend his own Creed to any thing may certainely follow from any one of the Articles; but I ſay, that no ſuch deduction is fit to be preſt on others as an Article of Faith; and that every deduction which is ſo made, unleſſe it be ſuch a thing as is at firſt evident to all, is but ſufficient to make a humane Faith, nor can it amount to a divine, much leſſe can be obligatory to binde a perſon of a differing perſwaſion to ſubſcribe under paine of looſing his Faith, or being a Heretick. For it is a demonſtration, that nothing can be neceſſary to be believed under paine of damnation, but ſuch propoſitions of which it is certaine that God hath ſpoken and taught them to us, and of which it is certaine that this is their ſenſe and purpoſe: For if the ſenſe be uncertain, we can no more be obliged to believe it in a certain ſenſe, then we are to believe it at all, if it were not certaine that God delivered it. But if it be onely certaine that

Numb. 12.

God spake it, and not certaine to what sense, our Faith of it is to be as indeterminate as its sense, and it can be no other in the nature of the thing, nor is it consonant to Gods justice to believe of him that he can or will require more. And this is of the nature of those propositions which *Aristotle* calls *Primi*, to which without any further probation all wise men will give assent at its first publication. And therefore deductions inevident, from the evident and plain letter of Faith, are as great recessions from the obligation as they are from the simplicity, and certainty of the Article. And this I also affirm, although the Church of any one denomination, or represented in a Councell, shall make the deduction or declaration. For unlesse Christ had promised his Spirit to protect every particular Church from all errors lesse materiall, unlesse he had promised an absolute universall infallibility *etiam in minutioribus*, unlesse super-structures be of the same necessity with the foundation, and that Gods Spirit doth not only preserve his Church in the being of a Church, but in a certainty of not saying any thing that is lesse certain; and that whether they will or no too; we may be bound to peace and obedience, to silence, and to charity, but have not a new Article of Faith made; and a new proposition though consequent (as 'tis said) from an Article of Faith becomes not therefore a part of the Faith, nor of absolute necessity, *Quid unquam aliud Ecclesia Conciliorum decretis evisa est, nisi ut quod antea simpliciter credebatur, hoc idem posteà diligentiùs crederetur*, said *Vincentius Lirinensis*, whatsoever was of necessary beliefe before is so still, and hath a new degree added by reason of a new light or a clear explication; but no propositions can be adopted into the foundation. The Church hath power to intend our Faith, but not to extend it; to make our beliefe more evident, but not more large and comprehensive. For Christ and his Apostles concealed nothing that was necessary to the integrity of Christian Faith, or salvation of our souls; Christ declared all the will of his Father, and the Apostles were Stewards and Dispensers of the same Mysteries, and were faithfull in all the house, and therefore conceald nothing, but taught the whole Doctrine of Christ; so they said themselves. And indeed if they did not teach all the Doctrine of Faith, an Angel or a man might have taught us other things then

Contra hæres. cap. 32.

then what they taught, without deſerving an Anathema, but not without deſerving a bleſſing for making up that Faith intire which the Apoſtles left imperfect. Now if they taught all the whole body of Faith, either the Church in the following Ages loſt part of the Faith (and then where was their infallibility, and the effect of thoſe glorious promiſes to which ſhe pretends and hath certain Title; for ſhe may as well introduce a falſhood as looſe a truth, it being as much promiſed to her that the Holy Ghoſt ſhall lead her into all truth, as that ſhe ſhall be preſerved from all errors as appears, *Ioh.*16.13.) Or if ſhe retaind all the Faith which Chriſt and his Apoſtles conſign'd and taught, then no Age can by declaring any point, make that be an Article of Faith which was not ſo in all Ages of Chriſtianity before ſuch declaration. And indeed if the * Church by declaring an Article can make that to be neceſſary, which before was not neceſſary, I doe not ſee how it can ſtand with the charity of the Church ſo to doe (eſpecially after ſo long experience ſhee hath had that all men will not believe every ſuch deciſion or explication) for by ſo doing ſhe makes the narrow way to heaven narrower, and chalks out one path more to the Devill then he had before, and yet the way was broad enough when it was at the narroweſt. For before, differing perſons might be ſaved in diverſity of perſwaſions, and now after this declaration if they cannot, there is no other alteration made, but that ſome ſhall be damned who before even in the ſame diſpoſitions and beliefe ſhould have been beatified perſons. For therefore, it is well for the Fathers of the Primitive Church that their errors were not diſcovered, for if they had been conteſted (for that would have been cald diſcovery enough) *vel errores emendaſſent, vel ab Eccleſiâ ejecti fuiſſent.* But it is better as it was, they went to heaven by that good fortune, whereas otherwiſe they might have gone to the Devill. And yet there were ſome errors, particularly that of S.*Cyprian* that was diſcovered, and he went to heaven, 'tis thought; poſſibly they might ſo too for all this pretence. But ſuppoſe it true, yet whether that declaration of an Article of which with ſafety we either might have doubted or beene ignorant, does more good, then the damning of thoſe many ſoules occaſionally, but yet certainely and foreknowingly

* Vide Iacob Almain. in 3. Sent. d. 25. Q. Vnic. Dub. 3 Patet ergo, quod nulla veritas eſt Catholica ex approbatione Eccleſiæ vel Papæ, *Gabr. Biel. in 3. S. nt. Diſt. 25. q. Vnic. art. 3. Dub. 3. ad finem.*

Bellar. de laicis l. 3. c. 20. §. ad primam confirmat onem.

knowingly does hurt, I leave it to all wise and good men to determine. And yet besides this, it cannot enter into my thoughts, that it can possibly consist with Gods goodnesse, to put it into the power of man so palpably and openly to alter the paths and in-lets to heaven, and to streighten his mercies, unlesse he had furnished these men with an infallible judgement and an infallible prudence, and a never failing charity, that they should never doe it but with great necessity, and with great truth, and without ends and humane designes, of which I think no Arguments can make us certaine, what the Primitive Church hath done in this case: I shall afterwards consider and give an account of it, but for the present, there is no insecurity in ending there where the Apostles ended, in building where they built, in resting where they left us, unlesse the same infallibility which they had, had still continued, which I think I shall hereafter make evident it did not: And therefore those extensions of Creed which were made in the first Ages of the Church, although for the matter they were most true; yet because it was not certain that they should be so, and they might have been otherwise, therefore they could not be in the same order of Faith, nor in the same degrees of necessity to be believ'd with the Articles Apostolicall; and therefore whether they did well or no in laying the same weight upon them, or whether they did lay the same weight or no, we will afterwards consider.

Numb. 13. But to return. I consider that a foundation of Faith cannot alter, unlesse a new building be to be made, the foundation is the same still; and this foundation is no other but that which Christ and his Apostles laid, which Doctrine is like himselfe, yesterday and to day, and the same for ever: So that the Articles of necessary beliefe to all (which are the only foundation) they cannot be severall in severall Ages, and to severall persons. Nay, the sentence & declaration of the Church, cannot lay this foundation, or make any thing of the foundation, because the Church cannot lay her own foundation; we must suppose her to be a building, and that she relies upon the foundation, which is therefore supposed to be laid before, because she is built upon it, or (to make it more explicate) because a cloud may arise from the Allegory of building and foundation, it is plainly thus; The Church being

being a company of men obliged to the duties of Faith and obedience, the duty and obligation being of the faculties of will and understanding to adhere to such an object, must pre-suppose the object made ready for them; for as the object is before the act in order of nature, and therefore not to be produc'd or encreased by the faculty (which is receptive, cannot be active upon its proper object:) So the object of the Churches Faith is in order of nature before the Church, or before the act and habite of Faith, and therefore cannot be enlarged by the Church, any more then the act of the visive faculty can adde visibility to the object. So that if we have found out what foundation Christ and his Apostles did lay, that is what body and systeme of Articles simply necessary they taught and requir'd of us to believe, we need not, we cannot goe any further for foundation, we cannot enlarge that systeme or collection. Now then, although all that they said is true, and nothing of it to be doubted or dis-believed, yet as all that they said, is neither written nor delivered (because all was not necessary) so we know that of those things which are written, some things are as farre off from the foundation as those things which were omitted, and therefore although now accidentally they must be beliv'd by all that know them, yet it is not necessary all should know them; and that all should know them in the same sense and interpretation, is neither probable nor obligatory; but therefore since these things are to be distinguished by some differences of necessary and not necessary, whether or no is not the declaration of Christs and his Apostles affixing salvation to the beliefe of some great comprehensive Articles, and the act of the Apostles rendring them as explicite as they thought convenient, and consigning that Creed made so explicite, as a tessera of a Christian, as a comprehension of the Articles of his beliefe, as a sufficient disposition and an expresse of the Faith of a *Catechumen* in order to Baptism: whether or no I say, all this be not sufficient probation that these only are of absolute necessity, that this is sufficient for meer beliefe in order to heaven, and that therefore whosoever believes these Articles heartily and explicitely, Θεὸς μένει ἐν αὐτῷ, as S. *John*'s expression is, *God dwelleth in him*, I leave it to be

 consider'd

conſider'd and judg'd of from the premiſes: Only this, if the old Doctors had been made Judges in theſe Queſtions, they would have paſſed their affirmative; for to inſtance in one for all, of this it was ſaid by *Tertullian*, *Regula quidem fidei una omnino eſt ſola immobilis & irreformabilis &c. Hâc lege fidei manente cætera jam diſciplinæ & converſationis admittunt novitatem correctionis, operante ſcil. & proficiente uſq; in finem gratia Dei.* This Symbol is the one ſufficient immoveable unalterable and unchangeable rule of Faith, that admits no increment or decrement; but if the integrity and unity of this be preſerv'd, in all other things men may take a liberty of enlarging their knowledges and propheſyings, according as they are aſſiſted by the grace of God.

Lib. de veland. Virg.

Sect. II.

Of Hereſy and the nature of it, and that it is to be accounted according to the ſtrict capacity of Chriſtian Faith, and not in Opinions ſpeculative, nor ever to pious perſons.

Numb. 1. And thus I have repreſented a ſhort draught of the Object of Faith, and its foundation; the next conſideration in order to our maine deſign, is to conſider what was and what ought to be the judgement of the Apoſtles concerning Hereſy: For although there are more kinds of vices, than there are of vertues; yet the number of them is to be taken by accounting the tranſgreſſions of their vertues, and by the limits of Faith; we may alſo reckon the Analogy and proportions of Hereſy, that as we have ſeen who was called faithfull by the Apoſtolicall men, wee may alſo perceive who were liſted by them in the Catalogue of Hereticks, that we in our judgements may proceed accordingly.

Numb. 2. And firſt the word Hereſy is uſed in Scripture indifferently, in a good ſenſe for a Sect or Diviſion of Opinion, and men following it, or ſometimes in a bad ſenſe, for a falſe Opinion ſignally condemned; but theſe kinde of people were then cald Anti-

Anti-chriſts and falſe Prophets more frequently then Hereticks, and then there were many of them in the world. But it is obſerveable that no Hereſies are noted *ſignanter* in Scripture, but ſuch as are great errors practicall *in materâ pietatis*, ſuch whoſe doctrines taught impiety, or ſuch who denyed the comming of Chriſt directly or by conſequence, not remote or wiredrawn, but prime and immediate: And therefore in the Code *de S. Trinitate & fide Catholica*, hereſy is called ἀσεβὴς δόξα, καὶ ἀθέμιτος διδασκαλία, a wicked Opinion and an ungodly doctrine.

The firſt falſe doctrine we finde condemned by the Apoſtles was the opinion of *Simon Magus*, who thought the Holy Ghoſt was to be bought with money; he thought very diſhonourably to the bleſſed Spirit; but yet his followers are rather noted of a vice, neither reſting in the underſtanding, nor derived from it, but wholy practicall; Tis ſimony, not hereſy, though in *Simon* it was a falſe opinion proceeding from a low account of God, and promoted by his own ends of pride and covetouſneſſe: The great hereſy that troubled them was the doctrine of the neceſſity of keeping the Law of *Moſes*, the neceſſity of Circumciſion; againſt which doctrine they were therſore zealous, becauſe it was a direct overthrow to the very end and excellency of Chriſts comming. And this was an opinion moſt petinaciouſly and obſtinately maintain'd by the Jewes, and had made a Sect among the *Galathians*, and this was indeed wholy in opinion; and againſt it the Apoſtles oppoſed two Articles of the Creed, which ſerv'd at ſeverall times according as the Jewes chang'd their opinion, and left ſome degrees of their error, *I believe in Jeſus Chriſt, and I believe the holy Catholike Church*; For they therefore preſſ'd the neceſſity of *Moſes* Law, becauſe they were unwilling to forgoe the glorious appellative of being Gods own peculiar people; and that ſalvation was of the Jewes, and that the reſt of the world were capable of that grace, no otherwiſe but by adoption into their Religion, and becomming Proſelytes: But this was ſo ill a doctrine, as that it overthrew the great benefits of Chriſt's comming; for *if they were circumciſ'd, Chriſt profited them nothing*, meaning this, that Chriſt will not be a Saviour to them who doe not acknowledge him for their Law-Giver; and they neither confeſſe him their Law-Giver nor *Numb.* 3.

their Saviour, that look to be juſtified by the Law of *Moſes*, and obſervation of legall rites; ſo that this doctrine was a direct enemy to the foundation, and therefore the Apoſtles were ſo zealous againſt it. Now then that other opinion, which the Apoſtles met at *Jeruſalem* to reſolve, was but a piece of that opinion; for the Iewes and Proſelytes were drawn off from their lees and ſediment, by degrees, ſtep by ſtep. At firſt, they would not endure any ſhould be ſaved but themſelves, and their Proſelytes. Being wrought off from this heigth by Miracles, and preaching of the Apoſtles, they admitted the Gentiles to a poſſibility of ſalvation, but yet ſo as to hope for it by *Moſes* Law. From which foolery, when they were with much adoe diſſwaded, and told that ſalvation was by Faith in Chriſt, not by works of the Law, yet they reſolv'd to plow with an Oxe and an Aſſe ſtill, and joyne *Moſes* with Chriſt; not as ſhadow and ſubſtance, but in an equall confederation, Chriſt ſhould ſave the Gentiles if he was helpt by *Moſes* but alone Chriſtianity could not doe it. Againſt this the Apoſtles aſſembled at *Jeruſalem*, and made a deciſion of the Queſtion, tying ſome of the Gentiles (ſuch only who were blended by the Iewes *in communi patria*) to obſervation of ſuch Rites which the Iewes had derived by tradition from *Noah*, intending by this to ſatisfie the Iewes as farre as might be with a reaſonable compliance and condeſcenſion; the other Gentiles who were unmixt, in the meane while, remaining free as appeares in the liberty S. *Paul* gave the Church of *Corinth* of eating Idoll Sacrifices (expreſly againſt the Decree at *Jeruſalem*) ſo it were without ſcandall. And yet for all this care and curious diſcretion, a little of the leaven ſtill remain'd: All this they thought did ſo concern the Gentiles, that it was totally impertinent to the Iewes; ſtill they had a diſtinction to ſatisfie the letter of the Apoſtles Decree, and yet to perſiſt in their old opinion; and this ſo continued that fifteene Chriſtian Biſhops in ſucceſſion were circumciſed, even untill the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*, under *Adrian*, as *Euſebius* reports.

Euſeb. l. 4. Eccleſ. hiſt. c. 5.

Numb. 4. Firſt, By the way let me obſerve, that never any matter of Queſtion in the Chriſtian Church was determin'd with greater ſolennity, or more full authority of the Church then this Queſtion

ſtion concerning Circumciſion: No leſſe than the whole Colledge of the Apoſtles, and Elders at *Jeruſalem*, and that with a Decree of the higheſt ſanction, *Viſum eſt ſpiritui ſancto & nobis.* Secondly, Either the caſe of the Hebrewes in particular was omitted, and no determination concerning them, whether it were neceſſary or lawfull for them to be circumciſed, or elſe it was involv'd in the Decree, and intended to oblige the Jewes. If it was omitted ſince the Queſtion was *de re neceſſaria* (for *dico vobis*, I *Paul* ſay unto you, *if ye be circumciſed, Chriſt ſhall profit you nothing*) it is very remarkable how the Apoſtles to gaine the Iewes, and to comply with their violent prejudice in behalfe of *Moſes* Law, did for a time Tolerate their diſſent *etiam in re aliòquin neceſſariâ*, which I doubt not but was intended as a precedent for the Church to imitate for ever after: But if it was not omitted, either all the multitude of the Iewes (which S. *James* then their Biſhop expreſſed by μυριάδες; *Thou ſeeſt how many myriads of Jewes that believe and yet are zelots for the Law*; and *Euſebius* ſpeaking of *Juſtus* ſayes, he was one *ex infinitâ multitudine eorum qui ex circumciſione in Jeſum credebant*,) I ſay all theſe did periſh, and their believing in Chriſt ſerv'd them to no other ends, but in the infinity of their torments to upbraid them with hypocriſie and hereſie; or if they were ſav'd, it is apparent how mercifull God was and pitifull to humane infirmities, that in a point of ſo great concernment did pity their weakneſſe, and pardon their errors, and love their good minde, ſince their prejudice was little leſſe than inſuperable, and had faire probabilities, at leaſt, it was ſuch as might abuſe a wiſe and good man (and ſo it did many) they did *bono animo errare.* And if I miſtake not, this conſideration S. *Paul* urg'd as a reaſon why God forgave him who was a Perſecutor of the Saints, becauſe he did it ignorantly in unbelief, that is, he was not convinc'd in his underſtanding, of the truth of the way which he perſecuted, he in the meane while remaining in that incredulity not out of malice or ill ends, but the miſtakes of humanity and a pious zeale, therefore *God had mercy on him*: And ſo it was in this great Queſtion of circumciſion, here only was the difference, the invincibility of

2.

Act. 21. 20.

L. 3. c. 32. Eccleſ. Hiſt.

1. Tim. 1.

S. *Paul*'s error, and the honesty of his heart caused God so to pardon him as to bring him to the knowledge of Christ, which God therefore did because it was necessary, *necessitate medii*; no salvation was consistent with the actuall remanency of that error; but in the Question of Circumcision, although they by consequence did overthrow the end of Christ's comming: yet because it was such a consequence, which they being hindred by a prejudice not impious did not perceive, God tolerated them in their error till time and a continuall dropping of the lessons and dictates Apostolicall did weare it out, and then the doctrine put on it's apparell, and became cloathed with necessity; they in the meane time so kept to the foundation, that is, Iesus Christ crucified and risen againe, that although this did make a violent concussion of it, yet they held fast with their heart, what they ignorantly destroyed with their tongue, (which *Saul* before his conversion did not) that God upon other Titles, then an actuall dereliction of their error did bring them to salvation.

Numb.5. And in the descent of so many years, I finde not any one Anathema past by the Apostles or their Successors upon any of the Bishops of *Jerusalem*, or the Believers of the Circumcision, and yet it was a point as clearly determined, and of as great necessity as any of those Questions that at this day vex and crucifie Christendome.

Numb.6. Besides this Question, and that of the Resurrection, commenc'd in the Church of *Corinth*, and promoted with some variety of sense by *Hymenæus* and *Philetus* in *Asia*, who said that the Resurrection was past already, I doe not remember any other heresy nam'd in Scripture, but such as were errours of impiety, *seductiones in materiâ practicâ*, such as was particularly, forbidding to marry, and the heresy of the *Nicolaitans*, a doctrine that taught the necessity of lust and frequent fornication.

Numb.7. But in all the Animadversions against errours made by the Apostles in the New Testament, no pious person was condemn'd, no man that did invincibly erre, or *bona mente*; but something that was amisse *in genere morum*, was that which the Apostles did redargue. And it is very considerable, that even they

they of the Circumcision who in so great numbers did heartily believe in Christ, and yet most violently retaine Circumcision, and without Question went to Heaven in great numbers; yet of the number of these very men, they came deeply under censure, when to their errour they added impiety: So long as it stood with charity and without humane ends and secular interests, so long it was either innocent or conniv'd at; but when they grew covetous, and for filthy lucres sake taught the same doctrine which others did in the simplicity of their hearts, then they turn'd Hereticks, then they were term'd Seducers; and *Titus* was commanded to look to them, and to silence them; *For there are many that are intractable and vaine bablers, Seducers of minds, especially they of the Circumcision, who seduce whole houses, teaching things that they ought not, for filthy lucres sake.* These indeed were not to be indur'd, but to be silenced, by the conviction of sound doctrine, and to be rebuked sharply, and avoided.

For heresy is not an errour of the understanding, but an errour of the will. And this is clearly insinuated in Scripture, in the stile whereof Faith and a good life are made one duty, and vice is called opposite to Faith, and heresy opposed to holinesse and sanctity. So in S. *Paul*, *For* (saith he) *the end of the Commandement is charity out of a pure heart, and a good conscience, and faith unfained*; *à quibus quòd aberrarunt quidam*, from which charity, and purity, and goodnesse, and sincerity, because some have wandred, *deflexerunt ad vaniloquium.* And immediately after, he reckons the oppositions to faith and sound doctrine, and instances only in vices that staine the lives of Christians, *the unjust, the uncleane, the uncharitable, the lyer, the perjur'd person, & si quis alius qui sanæ doctrinæ adversatur*; these are the enemies of the true doctrine. And therefore S. *Peter* having given in charge, to adde to our vertue, patience, temperance, charity, and the like; gives this for a reason, for if these things be in you and abound, yee shall be fruitfull in the *knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ.* So that knowledge and faith is *inter præcepta morum*, is part of a good life: * And Saint *Paul* cals Faith or the forme of sound words, καθ' ὑυσεβείαν διδασκαλίαν, the doctrine that is according to godlinesse

Numb. 8.

1 Tim. 1.

* Quid igitur credulitas vel fides? opinor fideliter hominem Christo credere, id est, fidelem Deo esse, hoc est, fideliter Dei mandata servare, *So Salvian.*

† Ὁσιότης τῆς χριστιανῶν θρησκείας ; That's our Religion, or Faith, the whole manner of serving God, *c. de summâ Trinit. & fide Cathol.*

lineſſe, 1 *Tim.* 6. 3. † And *veritati credere*, and *in injuſtitiâ ſibi complacere*, are by the ſame Apoſtle oppoſed, and intimate, that piety and faith is all one thing; faith muſt be ὑγιὴς καὶ ἄμωμος, intire and holy too, or it is not right. It was the hereſy of the *Gnoſticks*, that it was no matter how men liv'd, ſo they did but believe aright: Which wicked doctrine *Tatianus* a learned Chriſtian did ſo deteſt, that he fell into a quite contrary, *Non eſt curandum quid quiſque credat, id tantum curandum eſt quod quiſque faciat*; And thence came the Sect *Encratites*: Both theſe hereſies ſprang from the too nice diſtinguiſhing the faith from the piety and good life of a Chriſtian: They are both but one duty. However, they may be diſtinguiſhed, if we ſpeak like Philoſophers; they cannot be diſtinguiſhed, when we ſpeak like Chriſtians. For to believe what God hath commanded, is in order to a good life; and to live well is the product of that believing, and as proper emanation from it, as from its proper principle, and as heat is from the fire. And therefore, in Scripture, they are uſed promiſcuouſly in ſenſe, and in expreſſion, as not only being ſubjected in the ſame perſon, but alſo in the ſame faculty; faith is as truly ſeated in the will as in the underſtanding, and a good life as meerly derives from the underſtanding as the will. Both of them are matters of choyce and of election, neither of them an effect naturall and invincible or neceſſary antecedently *(neceſſaria ut fiant, non neceſſariò facta.)* And indeed if we remember that S. *Paul* reckons hereſy amongſt the works of the fleſh, and ranks it with all manner of practicall impieties, we ſhall eaſily perceive that if a man mingles not a vice with his opinion, if he be innocent in his life, though deceiv'd in his doctrine his errour is his miſery, not his crime; it makes him an argument of weakneſſe and an object of pity, but not a perſon ſealed up to ruine and reprobation.

Numb. 9. For as the nature of faith is, ſo is the nature of hereſy, contraries having the ſame proportion and commenſuration. Now faith, if it be taken for an act of the underſtanding meerly, is ſo farre from being that excellent grace that juſtifies us, that it is not good at all, in any kinde but *in genere naturæ*, and makes the underſtanding better in it ſelfe, or pleaſing to God, juſt as

ſtrength

strength doth the arme, or beauty the face, or health the body; these are naturall perfections indeed, and so knowledge and a true beliefe is to the understanding. But this makes us not at all more acceptable to God; for then the unlearned were certainly in a damnable condition, and all good Scholars should be saved (whereas I am afraid too much of the contrary is true.) But unlesse Faith be made morall by the mixtures of choyce, and charity, it is nothing but a naturall perfection, not a grace or a vertue; and this is demonstrably prov'd in this, that by the confession of all men of all interests and perswasions, in matters of meer belief, invincible ignorance is our excuse if we be deceived, which could not be, but that neither to believe aright is commendable, nor to believe amisse is reprovable; but where both one and the other is voluntary and chosen antecedently or consequently, by prime election or *ex post facto*, and so comes to be consider'd in morality, and is part of a good life or a bad life respectively. Just so it is in heresy, if it be a design of ambition, and making of a Sect (so *Erasmus* expounds S. *Paul* αἱρετικὸν ἄνθρωπον, *sectarum* authorem*) if it be for filthy lucres sake as it was in some, that were of the circumcision, if it be of pride and love of preheminence, as it was in *Diotrephes* ὁ φιλοπρωτεύων, or out of pevishnesse and indocibleness of disposition, or of a contentious spirit, that is, that their feet are not shod with the preparation of the Gospel of peace; in all these cases the errour is just so damnable, as is its principle, but therefore damnable not of it selfe, but by reason of its adherencie. And if any shall say any otherwise, it is to say that some men shall be damned when they cannot help it, perish without their own fault, and be miserable for ever, because of their unhappinesse to be deceived through their own simplicity and naturall or accidentall, but inculpable infirmity.

* Alieni sunt à veritate qui se obarmant multitudine. *Chryst.*

For it cannot stand with the goodnesse of God, who does so know our infirmities, that he pardons many things in which our wills indeed have the least share (but some they have) but are overborn with the violence of an impetuous temptation; I say, it is inconsistent with his goodnesse to condemn those who erre where the error hath nothing of the will in it, who therefore cannot repent of their errour, because they believe *Numb.* 15.

it true, who therefore cannot make compensation because they know not that they are tyed to dereliction of it. And although all Hereticks are in this condition, that is, they believe their errours to be true; yet there is a vast difference between them who believe so out of simplicity, and them who are given over to believe a lie, as a punishment or an effect of some other wickedness or impiety. For all have a concomitant assent to the truth of what they believe; and no man can at the same time believe what he does not believe, but this assent of the understanding in Hereticks is caused not by force of Argument, but the Argument is made forcible by something that is amisse in his will; and although a Heretick may peradventure have a stronger Argument for his errour then some true Believer for his right perswasion; yet it is not considerable how strong his Argument is (because in a weak understanding, a small motive will produce a great perswasion, like gentle physick in a weak body) but that which here is considerable, is, what it is that made his Argument forcible. If his invincible and harmlesse prejudice, if his weaknesse, if his education, if his mistaking piety, if any thing that hath no venome, nor a sting in it, there the heartinesse of his perswasion is no sin, but his misery and his excuse: but if any thing that is evill *in genere morum* did incline his understanding, if his opinion did commence upon pride, or is nourished by covetousnesse, or continues through stupid carelesnesse, or increases by pertinacy, or is confirmed by obstinacy, then the innocency of the errour is disbanded, his misery is changed into a crime, and begins its own punishment. But by the way I must observe, that when I reckond *obstinacy* amongst those things which make a false opinion criminall, it is to be understood with some discretion and distinction. For there is an obstinacy of will which is indeed highly guilty of misdemeanour, and when the Schoole makes pertinacy or obstinacy to be the formality of heresy, they say not true at all, unlesse it be meant the obstinacy of the will and choyce; and if they doe, they speak imperfectly and inartificially, this being but one of the causes that makes errour become heresy; the adequate and perfect formality of heresy is whatsoever makes the errour voluntary and vi-

tious,

tious, as is cleare in Scripture, reckoning covetouſneſſe, and pride, and luſt, and whatſoever is vitious to be its cauſes; (and in habits, or morall changes and productions, whatever alters the eſſence of a habite, or gives it a new formality, is not to be reckoned the efficient but the forme) but there is alſo an obſtinacy (you may call it) but indeed, is nothing but a reſolution and confirmation of underſtanding, which is not in a mans power honeſtly to alter, and it is not all the commands of humanity, that can be Argument ſufficient to make a man leave believing that for which he thinks he hath reaſon, and for which he hath ſuch Arguments as heartily convince him. Now the perſiſting in an opinion finally, and againſt all the confidence and imperiouſneſſe of humane commands, that makes not this criminall obſtinacy, if the erring perſon have ſo much humility of will as to ſubmit to whatever God ſayes, and that no vice in his will hinders him from believing it. So that we muſt carefully diſtinguiſh continuance in opinion from obſtinacy, confidence of underſtanding from peeviſhneſſe of affection, a not being convinced from a reſolution never to be convinc'd, upon humane ends and vitious principles: *Scimus quoſdam quod ſemel imbiberint nolle deponere, nec propoſitum ſuum facile mutare, ſed ſalvo inter collegas pacis & concordiæ vinculo quædam propria quæ apud ſe ſemel ſint uſurpata retinere; Qua in re nec nos vim cuiquam facimus, aut legem damus*, ſaith S. *Cyprian*. And he himſelfe was ſuch a one; for hee perſiſted in his opinion of rebaptization untill death, and yet his obſtinacy was not called criminall, or his errour turned to hereſy. But to return. Lib. 2. Epiſt. 1.

In this ſenſe, it is that a Heretick is αὐτοκατάκριτος, ſelfe condemn'd, not by an immediate expreſſe ſentence of underſtanding, but by his own act or fault brought into condemnation. As it is in the Canon Law, *Notorius percuſſor Clerici* is *ipſo jure* excommunicate, not *per ſententiam latam ab homine*, but *à jure*. No man hath paſſed ſentence *pro tribunali*, but Law hath decreed it *pro edicto*: So it is in the caſe of a Heretick. The underſtanding which is judge, condemns him not by an expreſſe ſentence; for he erres with as much ſimplicity in the reſult, as he had malice in the principle: But there is *ſententia lata à jure*, his will which is his law, that hath condemn'd him. And this *Numb.* 11.

is gathered from that saying of S. *Paul*, 2 *Tim.* 3.13. *But evill men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived*: First, they are evill men; malice and peevishnesse is in their wills; then they turn Hereticks and seduce others, and while they grow worse and worse, the errour is master of their understanding, they are deceiv'd themselves, *given over to believe a lie*, saith the Apostle: They first play the knave, and then play the foole; they first sell themselves to the purchase of vaine-glory or ill ends, and then they become possessed with a lying spirit, and believe those things heartily, which if they were honest, they should with Gods Grace discover and disclaime. So that now we see that *bona fides in falso articulo*, a hearty perswasion in a false article does not alwayes make the errour to be esteemed involuntary; but then only when it is as innocent in the principle as it is confident in the present perswasion. And such persons who by their ill lives and vitious actions, or manifest designes (for by their fruits yee shall know them) give testimony of such criminall indispositions, so as competent judges by humane and prudent estimate may so judge them, then they are to be declared Hereticks, and avoided. And if this were not true, it were vaine that the Apostle commands us to avoid an Heretick: For no externall act can passe upon a man for a crime that is not cognoscible.

Numb. 12. Now every man that erres, though in a matter of consequence, so long as the foundation is intire, cannot be suspected justly guilty of a crime to give his error a formality of heresy; for we see many a good man miserably deceiv'd (as we shall make it appeare afterwards) and he that is the best amongst men, certainely hath so much humility to think he may be easily deceiv'd, and twenty to one but he is in some thing or other; yet if his error be not voluntary, and part of an ill life, then because he lives a good life, he is a good man, and therefore no Heretick: No man is a Heretick against his will. And if it be pretended that every man that is deceived, is therefore proud, because he does not submit his understanding to the authority of God or Man respectively, and so his errour becomes a heresy; To this I answer, That there is no Christian man

but

but will ſubmit his underſtanding to God, and believes whatſoever he hath ſaid; but alwayes provided, he knowes that God hath ſaid ſo, elſe he muſt doe his duty by a readineſſe to obey when he ſhall know it. But for obedience or humility of the underſtanding towards men, that is a thing of another conſideration, and it muſt firſt be made evident that his underſtanding muſt be ſubmitted to men; and who thoſe men are, muſt alſo be certaine, before it will be adjudg'd a ſinne not to ſubmit. But if I miſtake not Chriſts ſaying [*call no man maſter upon earth*] is ſo great a prejudice againſt this pretence, as I doubt it will goe neere wholy to make it invalid. So that as the worſhipping of Angels is a humility indeed, but it is voluntary and a will-worſhip to an ill ſence, not to be excuſed by the excellency of humility, nor the vertue of Religion: ſo is the relying upon the judgement of man, an humility too, but ſuch as comes not under that ὑπακοὴ πίστεως, that obedience of Faith which is the duty of every Chriſtian; but intrenches upon that duty which we owe to Chriſt as an acknowledgement that he is our great Maſter, and the Prince of the Catholike Church. But whether it be or be not, if that be the Queſtion whether the diſagreeing perſon be to be determined by the dictates of men, I am ſure the dictates of men muſt not determine him in that Queſtion, but it muſt be ſettled by ſome higher principle: So that if of that Queſtion the diſagreeing perſon does opine, or believe, or erre *bonâ fide*, he is not therefore to be judg'd a Heretick, becauſe he ſubmits not his underſtanding, becauſe till it bee ſufficiently made certaine to him that hee is bound to ſubmit, he may innocently and piouſly diſagree, and this not ſubmitting is therefore not a crime (and ſo cannot make a hereſy) becauſe without a crime he may lawfully doubt whether he be bound to ſubmit or no, for that's the Queſtion. And if in ſuch Queſtions which have influence upon a whole ſyſteme of Theology, a man may doubt lawfully if he doubts heartily, becauſe the authority of men being the thing in Queſtion, cannot bee the judge of this Queſtion, and therefore being rejected, or (which is all one) being queſtioned, that is, not believed, cannot render the doubting perſon guilty of pride, and by conſequence

not of heresy, much more may particular questions be doubted of, and the authority of men examined, and yet the doubting person be humble enough, and therefore no Heretick for all this pretence. And it would be considered that humility is a duty in great ones as well as in Idiots. And as inferiours must not disagree without reason, so neither must superiours prescribe to others without sufficient authority, evidence and necessity too: And if rebellion be pride, so is tyranny; and it being *in materiâ intellectuali*, both may be guilty of pride of understanding, sometimes the one in imposing, sometimes the other in a causeless disagreeing; but in the inferiours it is then only the want of humility, when the guides impose or prescribe what God hath also taught, and then it is the disobeying Gods dictates, not mans, that makes the sinne. But then this consideration will also intervene, that as no dictate of God obliges men to believe it, unless I know it to be such: So neither will any of the dictates of my superiours, engage my faith, unless I also know, or have no reason to disbelieve, but that they are warranted to teach them to me, therefore, because God hath taught the same to them, which if I once know, or have no reason to think the contrary, if I disagree, my sinne is not in resisting humane authority, but divine. And therefore the whole businesse of submitting our understanding to humane authority, comes to nothing; for either it resolves into the direct duty of submitting to God, or if it be spoken of abstractedly, it is no duty at all.

Numb. 13. But this pretence of a necessity of humbling the understanding, is none of the meanest arts whereby some persons have invaded, and usurpt a power over mens faith and consciences, and therefore we shall examine the pretence afterwards, and try if God hath invested any Man or company of Men with such a power. In the meane time, he that submits his understanding to all that he knowes God hath said, and is ready to submit to all that he hath said if he but know it, denying his own affections and ends, and interests and humane perswasions, laying them all down at the foot of his great Master Jesus Christ, that man hath brought his understanding into subjection, and every proud thought unto the obedience of

Christ

Chriſt, and this is ὑπακοὴ πίστεως, the obedience of Faith, which is the duty of a Chriſtian.

But to proceed: Beſides theſe hereſies noted in Scripture, the age of the Apoſtles, and that which followed, was inſeſted with other hereſies; but ſuch as had the ſame formality and malignity with the precedent, all of them either ſuch as taught practicall impieties, or denyed an Article of the Creed. *Egeſippus* in *Euſebius* reckons ſeven only prime hereſies that ſought to defloure the purity of the Church: That of *Simon*, that of *Thebutes*, of *Cleobius*, of *Doſitheus*, of *Gortheus*, of *Maſbotheus*; I ſuppoſe *Cerinthus* to have been the ſeventh man, though he expreſſe him not: But of theſe, except the laſt, we know no particulars; but that *Egeſippus* ſayes, they were falſe Chriſts, and that their doctrine was directly againſt God and his bleſſed Sonne. *Menander* alſo was the firſt of a Sect, but he bewitched the people with his Sorceries. *Cerinthus* his doctrine pretended Enthuſiaſm or a new Revelation, and ended in luſt and impious theorems in matter of uncleanneſſe. The **Ebionites* denyed Chriſt to be the Sonne of God, and affirmed him ψιλὸν ἄνθρωπον, begot by naturall generation, (by occaſion of which and the importunity of the *Aſian* Biſhops, S. *John* writ his Goſpel) and taught the obſervation of *Moſes* Law. *Baſilides* taught it lawfull to renounce the faith, and take falſe oaths in time of Perſecution. *Carpocrates* was a very bedlam, halfe-witch, and quite mad-man, and practizd luſt, which he cald the ſecret operations to overcome the Potentates of the world. Some more there were, but of the ſame nature and peſt, not of a nicety in diſpute, not a queſtion of ſecret Philoſophy, not of atomes, and undiſcernable propoſitions, but open defiances of all Faith, of all ſobriety, and of all ſanctity, excepting only the doctrine of the Millenaries, which in the beſt Ages was eſteemed no hereſy, but true Catholike Doctrine, though ſince it hath juſtice done to it, and hath ſuffered a juſt condemnation. *Numb.* 14.

* VII. Hilar. lib. 1. de Trin.

Hitherto, and in theſe inſtances, the Church did eſteeme and judge of hereſies, in proportion to the rules and characters of Faith. For Faith being a Doctrine of piety as well as truth, that which was either deſtructive of fundamentall verity, or *Numb.* 15.

of

of Chriſtian ſanctity was againſt Faith, and if it made a Sect, was hereſy; if not, it ended in perſonall impiety and went no farther. But thoſe who as S. *Paul* ſayes, not only did ſuch things, but had pleaſure in them that doe them, and therefore taught others to do what they impiouſly did dogmatize, they were Hereticks both in matter and form, in doctrine and deportment, towards God, and towards man, and judicable in both tribunals.

Numb. 16. But the Scripture and Apoſtolicall Sermons, having expreſſed moſt high indignation againſt theſe maſters of impious Sects, leaving them under prodigious characters, and horrid repreſentments, as calling them *men of corrupt minds, reprobates concerning the faith, given over to ſtrong deluſions to the beliefe of a lye, falſe Apoſtles, falſe Prophets, men already condemned, and that by themſelves, Anti-chriſts, enemies of God*; and hereſy it ſelfe, *a work of the fleſh, excluding from the kingdome of heaven*; left ſuch impreſſions in the minds of all their ſucceſſours, and ſo much zeal againſt ſuch Sects, that if any opinion commenc'd in the Church, not heard of before; it oftentimes had this ill luck to run the ſame fortune with an old hereſy. For becauſe the Hereticks did bring in new opinions in matters of great concernment, every opinion *de novo* brought in was lyable to the ſame exception; and becauſe the degree of malignity in every errour was oftentimes undiſcernable, and moſt commonly indemonſtrable, their zeale was alike againſt all; and thoſe Ages being full of piety, were fitted to be abuſed with an overactive zeale, as wiſe perſons and learned are with a too much indifferency.

Numb. 17. But it came to paſſe, that the further the ſucceſſion went from the Apoſtles, the more forward men were in numbring hereſies, and that upon ſlighter and more uncertain grounds. Some foot-ſteps of this wee ſhall finde, if we conſider the Sects that are ſaid to have ſprung in the firſt three hundred years, and they were pretty and quick in their ſprings and falls; foureſcore and ſeven of them are reckoned. They were indeed reckoned afterward, and though when they were alive, they were not condemn'd with as much forwardneſſe, as after they were dead; yet even then, confidence began to mingle with opinions leſſe neceſſary, and miſtakes in judgement were

oftener

t'oftener and more publike then they ſhould have been. But if t'hey were forward in their cenſures (as ſome times ſome of hem were) it is no great wonder they were deceiv'd. For what principle or κρίτηριον had they then to judge of hereſies, or condemn them, beſides the ſingle dictates or decretals of private Biſhops? for Scripture was indifferently pretended by all; and concerning the meaning of it, was the Queſtion: now there was no generall Councell all that while, no opportunity for the Church to convene; and if we ſearch the communicatory letters of the Biſhops and Martyrs in thoſe dayes, we ſhall finde but few ſentences decretory concerning any Queſtion of Faith, or new ſprung opinion. And in thoſe that did, for ought appeares, the perſons were miſ-reported, or their opiniors miſtaken, or at moſt, the ſentence of condemnation was no more but this; Such a Biſhop who hath had the good fortune by poſterity to be reputed a Catholike, did condemn ſuch a man or ſuch an opinion, and yet himſelfe err'd in as conſiderable matters, but meeting with better neighbours in his life time, and a more charitable poſterity, hath his memory preſerv'd in honour. It appears plain enough in the caſe of *Nicholas* the Deacon of *Antioch*, upon a miſtake of his words whereby he taught παραχρῆσθαι τῇ σαρκὶ to abuſe the fleſh, *viz.* by acts of auſterity and ſelfe denyall, and mortification; ſome wicked people that were glad to be miſtaken and abuſed into a pleaſing crime, pretended that he taught them to abuſe the fleſh by filthy commixtures and pollutions: This miſtake was tranſmitted to poſterity with a full cry, and acts afterwards found out to juſtifie an ill opinion of him. For by S. *Hierome's* time it grew out of Queſtion, but that he was the vileſt of men, and the worſt of Hereticks; *Nicolaus Antiochenus, omnium immunditiarum conditor choros duxit famineos.* And againe, *Iſte Nicolaus Diaconus ita immundus extitit ut etiam in præſepi Domini nefas perpetrârit*: Accuſations that while the good man liv'd were never thought of: for his daughters were Virgins, and his Sons liv'd in holy cœlibate all their lives, and himſelfe liv'd in chaſt Wedlock; and yet his memory had rotted in perpetuall infamy, had not God (in whoſe ſight, the memory of the Saints is precious) preſerv'd it by the teſti-

Ad Cteſiph.

Epiſt. de Fabiano lapſo.

mony of * *Clemens Alexandrinus*, and from him of † *Eusebius* and *Nicephorus*. But in the Catalogue of Hereticks made by *Philastrius* he stands markt with a black character as guilty of many heresies: By which one testimony we may guesse what trust is to be given to those Catalogues: Well, This good man had ill luck to fall into unskilfull hands at first; but *Irenæus*, *Justin Maryr*, *Lactantius*, (to name no more) had better fortune; for it being still extant in their writings that they were of the Millenary opinion, *Papias* before, and *Nepos* after were censured hardly, and the opinion put into the catalogue of heresies and yet these men never suspected as guilty, but like the children of the Captivity walkt in the midst of the flame, and not so much as the smell of fire passed on them. But the uncertainty of these things is very memorable, in the Story of *Eustathius* Bishop of *Antioch* contesting with *Eusebius Pamphilus*: *Eustathius* accused *Eusebius* for going about to corrupt the *Nicene* Creed, of which slander he then acquitted himselfe (saith *Socrates*) and yet he is not cleared by posterity, for still he is suspected, and his fame not cleare: However *Eusebius* then scap'd well, but to be quit with his Adversary, he recriminates and accuses him to be a favourer of *Sabellius*, *rather then of the Nicene Canons*; an imperfect accusation, God knowes, when the crime was a suspition, proveable only by actions capable of divers constructions, and at the most, made but some degrees of probability, and the fact it selfe did not consist *in indivisibili*, and therefore was to stand or fall, to be improv'd or lessen'd according to the will of the Judges, whom in this cause *Eustathius* by his ill fortune and a potent Adversary found harsh towards him, in so much that he was for heresy deposed in the Synod of *Antioch*; and though this was layd open in the eye of the world as being most ready at hand, with the greatest ease charged upon every man, and with greatest difficulty acquitted by any man; yet there were other suspicions raised upon him privately, or at least talkt of *ex post facto*, and pretended as causes of his deprivation, least the sentence should seem too hard for the first offence. And yet what they were no man could tell, saith the story. But it is observable what *Socrates* saith, as in excuse of such proceedings

* L. 3. Stromat.

† L. 3. c. 26. Hist.

L. 2. c. 23.

Let

Τῦτο ϑ ὅτι πάντων εἰώθασι ϕϑ καταψυμένων ποιεῖν οἱ ἐπίσκοποι, κακηγορῦντες μ χ ἀσεβῆ λέγοντες, τὰς ϑ ἁμαρτίας τ ἀσεβείας ὐ λέγυσι. " It " is the manner among the Biſhops, when they accuſe them " that are depoſed, they call them wicked, but they publiſh " not the actions of their impiety. It might poſſibly be that the Biſhops did it in tenderneſſe of their reputation, but yet hardly; for to puniſh a perſon publikely and highly, is a certain declaring the perſon puniſhed guilty of a high crime, and then to conceale the fault upon pretence to preſerve his reputation, leaves every man at liberty, to conjecture what he pleaſeth, who poſſibly will believe it worſe than it is, in as much as they think his judges ſo charitable as therefore to conceale the fault, leaſt the publiſhing of it ſhould be his greateſt puniſhment, and the ſcandall greater then his deprivation. * However this courſe, if it were juſt in any, was unſafe in all; for it might undoe more then it could preſerve, and therefore is of more danger, then it can be of charity. It is therefore too probable that the matter was not very faire; for in publike ſentence the acts ought to be publike; but that they rather pretend hereſy to bring their ends about, ſhewes how eaſie it is to impute that crime, and how forward they were to doe it: And that they might and did then as eaſily call Heretick as afterward, when *Vigilius* was condemned of hereſy for ſaying there were *Antipodes*; or as the Fryars of late did, who ſuſpected Greek and Hebrew of hereſy, and cald their Profeſſors Hereticks, and had like to have put *Terence* and *Demoſthenes* into the *Index Expurgatorius*; ſure enough they raild at them *pro concione*, therefore becauſe they underſtood them not, and had reaſon to believe they would accidentally be enemies to their reputation among the people.

L. 1. c. 24.

* Simpliciter pateat vitium fortaſſe puſillum, Quod tegitur majus creditur eſſe malum. *Martial.*

By this inſtance which was a while after the *Nicene* Councell, where the acts of the Church were regular, judiciall and orderly, we may gueſſe at the ſentences paſſed upon hereſy, at ſuch times and in ſuch caſes, when their proceſſe was more private, and their acts more tumultuary, their information leſſe certaine, and therefore their miſtakes more eaſie and frequent. And it is remarkable in the caſe of the hereſy of *Montanus*, the ſcene of whoſe hereſy lay within the firſt three hundred yeares, though

Numb. 19.

though it was repreſented in the Catalogues afterwards, and poſſibly the miſtake concerning it, is to be put upon the ſcore of *Epiphanius*, by whom *Montanus* and his Followers were put into the Catalogue of Hereticks for commanding abſtinence from meats, as if they were unclean, and of themſelves unlawfull. Now the truth was, *Montanus* ſaid no ſuch thing, but commanded frequent abſtinence, enjoyned dry diet, and an aſcetick Table, not for conſcience ſake, but for Diſcipline; and yet becauſe he did this with too much rigour and ſtrictneſſe of mandate, the Primitive Church miſlik'd it in him, as being too neere their errour, who by a Judaicall ſuperſtition abſtain'd from meats as from uncleanneſſe. This by the way will much concern them who place too much ſanctity in ſuch Rites and Acts of Diſcipline; for it is an eternall Rule and of never failing truth, that ſuch abſtinences if they be obtruded as Acts of originall immediate duty and ſanctity, are unlawfull and ſuperſtitious; if they be for Diſcipline they may be good, but of no very great profit; it is that ὠφελία τῆς σωματικῆς which S. *Paul* ſayes profiteth but little; and juſt in the ſame degree the Primitive Church eſteem'd them; for they therefore reprehended *Montanus*, for urging ſuch abſtinences with too much earneſtneſſe, though but in the way of Diſcipline, for that it was no more, *Tertullian*, who was himſelfe a *Montaniſt*, and knew beſt the opinions of his own Sect, teſtifies; and yet *Epiphanius* reporting the errours of *Montanus*, commends that which *Montanus* truly and really taught, and which the Primitive Church condemn'd in him, and therefore repreſents that hereſy to another ſenſe, and affixes that to *Montanus*, which *Epiphanius* beliv'd a hereſy, and yet which *Montanus* did not teach. And this alſo among many other things leſſens my opinion very much of the integrity or diſcretion of the old Catalogues of Hereticks, and much abates my confidence towards them.

Numb. 19. And now that I have mentioned them caſually in paſſing by, I ſhall give a ſhort account of them; for men are much miſtaken; ſome in their opinions concerning the truth of them, as believing them to be all true, ſome concerning their purpoſe as thinking them ſufficient not only to condemn all thoſe

thoſe opinions, there called hereticall; but to be a precedent to all Ages of the Church to be free and forward in calling Heretick. But he that conſiders the Catalogues themſelves, as they are collected by *Epiphanius*, *Philaſtrius*, and S. *Auſtin*, ſhall finde that many are reckoned for Hereticks for opinions in matters diſputable, and undetermin'd, and of no conſequence; and that in theſe Catalogues of Hereticks there are men numbred for Hereticks, which by every ſide reſpectively are acquitted; ſo that there is no company of men in the world that admit theſe Catalogues as good Records, or ſufficient ſentences of condemnation. For the Churches of the Reformation, I am certain, they acquit *Aërius* for denying prayer for the dead, and the *Euſtathians* for denying invocation of Saints. And I am partly of opinion that the Church of *Rome* is not willing to call the *Collyridians* Hereticks for offering a Cake to the Virgin *Mary*, unleſſe ſhe alſo will runne the hazard of the ſame ſentence for offering Candles to her: And that they will be glad with S. *Auſtin* (*l. 6. de hæreſ. c.* 86.) to excuſe the * *Tertullianiſts* for picturing God in a viſible corporall repreſentment. And yet theſe Sects are put in the black book by *Epiphanius* and S. *Auſtin*, and *Iſidore* reſpectively. I remember alſo that the *Oſſeni* are cald Hereticks, becauſe they refuſed to worſhip toward the Eaſt; and yet in that diſſent, I finde not the malignity of a hereſy, nor anything againſt an Article of Faith or good manners; and it being only in circumſtance, it were hard, if they were otherwiſe pious men and true believers, to ſend them to Hell for ſuch a triſle. The *Parermeneutæ* refuſed to follow other mens dictates like ſheep, but would expound Scripture according to the beſt evidence themſelves could finde, and yet were called Hereticks whether they expounded true or no. The * *Pauliciani* for being offended at croſſes, the *Procliani* for ſaying in a regenerate man all his ſinnes were not quite dead, but only curbed and aſſwaged, were called Hereticks, and ſo condemned; for ought I know for affirming that which all pious men feele in themſelves to be too true. And he that will conſider how numerous the Catalogues are, and to what a volumn they are come in their laſt collections, to no leſſe then five hundred and twenty

* D. *Thom.* 1. contr. gent. c. 21.

* Euthym. part. 1. tit. 21. Epiphan. hæreſ. 64.

(for so many heresies and Hereticks are reckoned by *Prateolus*) may think that if a re-trenchment were justly made of truths, and all impertinencies, and all opinions, either still disputable, or lesse considerable, the number would much decrease; and therefore that the Catalogues are much amisse, and the name Heretick is made a *terriculamentum* to affright people from their beliefe, or to discountenance the persons of men, and disreputе them, that their Schooles may be empty and their Disciples few.

Numb. 20. So that I shall not neede to instance how that some men were called Hereticks by *Philastrius* for rejecting the translation of the Lxx. and following the Bible of *Aquila*, wherein the great faults mentioned by *Philastrius*, are that he translates Χριστὸν Θεοῦ, not *Christum*, but *unctum Dei*, and in stead of *Emanuel* writes *Deus nobiscum*. But this most concerns them of the Primitive Church with whom the translation of *Aquila* was in great reputation, *is enim veluti plus à quibusdam . . . . . intellexisse laudatur.* It was supposed he was a greater Clerk and understood more then ordinary; it may be so he did. But whether yea or no, yet since the other Translators by the Confession of *Philastrius*, *quædam prætermisisse necessitate urgente cogerentur*, if some wise men or unwise did follow a Translatour who understood the Originall well (for so *Aquila* had learnt amongst the Jewes) it was hard to call men Hereticks for following his Translation, especially since the other Bibles (which were thought to have in them contradictories; and, it was confessed, had omitted some things) were excused by necessity, and the others necessity of following *Aquila*, when they had no better was not at all considered, nor a lesse crime then heresy laid upon their score *. Such another was the heresy of the *Quartodecimani*; for the *Easterlings* were all proclaimed Hereticks for keeping Easter after the manner of the East; and as *Socrates* and *Nicephorus* report, the Bishop of *Rome* was very forward to Excommunicate all the Bishops of the lesser *Asia* for observing the Feast according to the Tradition of their Ancestors, though they did it modestly, quietly, and without faction; and although they pretended, and were as well able to prove their Tradition from S. *John*, of so observing it,

* Philastr. 99. eos inter hæreticos numerat qui spiraculum vitæ in libro Geneseos interpretantur animam rationalem, & non potius gratiam Spiritus sancti.

it, as the Weſtern Church could prove their Tradition derivative from S. *Peter* and S. *Paul*. If ſuch things as theſe make up the Catalogues of Hereticks (as we ſee they did) their accounts differ from the Precedents they ought to have followed, that is, the cenſures Apoſtolicall, and therefore are unſafe Precedents for us; and unleſſe they took the liberty of uſing the word hereſy, in a lower ſenſe, then the world now doth, ſince the Councels have been forward in pronouncing Anathema, and took it only for a diſtinct ſenſe, and a differing perſwaſion in matters of opinion and minute Articles, we cannot excuſe the perſons of the men: But if they intended the crime of hereſy againſt thoſe opinions as they laid them down in their Catalogues, that crime (I ſay) which is a work of the fleſh, which excludes from the Kingdome of Heaven, all that I ſhall ſay againſt them, is, that the cauſleſſe curſe ſhall return empty, and no man is damn'd the ſooner, becauſe his enemy cryes ὦ καλέπαπε, and they that were the Judges and Accuſers might erre as well as the perſons accuſed, and might need as charitable conſtruction of their opinions and practices as the other. And of this we are ſure they had no warrant from any rule of Scripture or practice Apoſtolicall, for driving ſo furiouſly and haſtily in ſuch decretory ſentences. But I am willing rather to believe their ſenſe of the word *hereſy* was more gentle then with us it is, and for that they might have warrant from Scripture.

But by the way, I obſerve that although theſe Catalogues are a great inſtance to ſhew that they whoſe Age and ſpirits were farre diſtant from the Apoſtles, had alſo other judgements concerning Faith and hereſy, then the Apoſtles had, and the Ages Apoſtolicall; yet theſe Catalogues although they are reports of hereſies in the ſecond and third Ages, are not to be put upon the account of thoſe Ages, nor to be reckoned as an inſtance of their judgement, which although it was in ſome degrees more culpable then that of their Predeceſſors, yet in reſpect of the following Ages it was innocent and modeſt. But theſe Catalogues I ſpeak of, were ſet down according to the ſenſe of the then preſentages, in which as they in all probability did differ from the apprehenſions of the former Centuries, ſo it is certain, there were differing learnings, other fancies, *Numb.* 21.

fancies, divers representments and judgements of men depending upon circumstances which the first Ages knew, and the following Ages did not; and therefore the Catalogues were drawn with some truth, but lesse certainty, as appears in their differing about the Authours of some heresies; severall opinions imputed to the same, and some put in the roll of Hereticks by one, which the other left out; which to me is an Argument that the Collectors were determin'd, not by the sense and sentences of the three first Ages but by themselves, and some circumstances about them, which to reckon for Hereticks, which not. And that they themselves were the prime Judges, or perhaps some in their own Age together with them; but there was not any sufficient externall judicatory competent to declare heresy that by any publike or sufficient sentence or acts of Court had furnished them with warrant for their Catalogues. And therefore they are no Argument sufficient that the first Ages of the Church, which certainly were the best, did much recede from that which I shewed to be the sense of the Scripture, and the practise of the Apostles; they all contented themselves with the Apostles Creed as the rule of the Faith; and therefore were not forward to judge of heresy, but by analogy to their rule of Faith: And those Catalogues made after these Ages are not sufficient Arguments that they did otherwise; but rather of the weakness of some persons, or of the spirit and genius of the Age in which the Compilers liv'd, in which the device of calling all differing opinions by the name of heresies, might grow to be a design to serve ends, and to promote interests, as often as an act of zeale and just indignation against evill persons destroyers of the Faith and corrupters of manners.

Numb. 22. For whatever private mens opinions were, yet till the *Nicene* Councell, the rule of Faith was intire in the Apostles Creed, and provided they retained that, easily they broke not the unity of Faith, however differing opinions might possibly commence in such things in which a liberty were better suffered then prohibited with a breach of charity. And this appears exactly in the Question between S. *Cyprian* of *Carthage*, and *Stephan* Bishop of *Rome*, in which one instance it is easie to see what was lawfull and safe for a wise and good man, and yet how others began

even

even then to be abused by that temptation, which since hath invaded all Christendome. S. *Cyprian* re-baptized Hereticks, and thought he was bound so to doe; calls a Synod in *Africk* as being Metropolitan, and confirms his opinion by the consent of his Suffragans and Brethren, but still with so much modesty, that if any man was of another opinion, he judg'd him not, but gave him that liberty that he desired himself; *Stephen* Bishop of *Rome* growes angry, Excommunicates the Bishops of *Asia* and *Africa*, that in divers Synods had consented to re-baptization, and without peace, and without charity, condemns them for Hereticks. Indeed here was the rarest mixture and conjunction of unlikelihoods that I have observed. Here was errour of opinion with much modesty and sweetnesse of temper on one side; and on the other, an over-active and impetuous zeal to attest a truth, it uses not to be so, for errour usually is supported with confidence, and truth suppressed and discountenanc'd by indifferency. But that it might appear that the errour was not the sinne, but the uncharitableness, *Stephan* was accounted a zealous and furious person, and S. * *Cyprian* though deceiv'd, yet a very good man, and of great sanctity. For although every errour is to be opposed, yet according to the variety of errours, so is there variety of proceedings. If it be against Faith, that is, a destruction of any part of the foundation, it is with zeal to be resisted, and we have for it an Apostolicall warrant, *contend earnestly for the Faith*; but then as these things recede farther from the foundation, our certainty is the lesse, and their necessity not so much, and therefore it were very fit, that our confidence should be according to our evidence, and our zeal according to our confidence, and our confidence should then be the Rule of our Communion; and the lightnesse of an Article should be considered with the weight of a precept of charity. And therefore, there are some errours to be reproved, rather by a private friend then a publike censure, and the persons of the men not avoided but admonished, and their Doctrine rejected, not their Communion; few opinions are of that malignity which are to be rejected with the same exterminating spirit, and confidence of aversation, with which the first Teachers of Christianity con-

* Vid. S. Aug. l. 2. c. 6. de baptis. contra Donat.

demn'd *Ebion*, *Manes*, and *Cerinthus*; and in the condemnation of Hereticks the personall iniquity is more considerable then the obliquity of the doctrine, not for the rejection of the Article, but for censuring the persons; and therefore it is the piety of the man that excused S. *Cyprian*, which is a certain Argument that it is not the opinion, but the impiety that condemns and makes the Heretick. And this was it which *Vincentius Lirinensis* said in this very case of S. *Cyprian*, *Vnius & ejusdem opinionis (mirum videri potest) judicamus authores Catholicos, & sequaces hæreticos. Excusamus Magistros, & condemnamus Scholasticos. Qui scripserunt libros sunt hæredes Cœli, quorum librorum defensores detrudduntur ad infernum.* Which saying, if we confront against the saying of *Salvian* condemning the first Authors of the *Arrian* Sect, and acquitting the Followers, we are taught by these two wise men, that an errour is not it that sends a man to Hell, but he that begins the heresy, and is the authour of the Sect, he is the man mark'd out to ruine; and his Followers scap'd, when the *Heresiarch* commenc'd the errour upon pride and ambition, and his Followers went after him in simplicity of their heart; and so it was most commonly: but on the contrary, when the first man in the opinion was honestly and invincibly deceived, as S. *Cyprian* was, and that his Scholars to maintaine their credit, or their ends, maintaind the opinion, not for the excellency of the reason perswading, but for the benefit and accruments, or peevishnesse, as did the *Donatists*, *qui de Cypriani authoritate sibi carnaliter blandiuntur*, as S. *Austin* said of them; then the Scholars are the Hereticks, and the Master is a Catholike. For his errour is not the heresy formally, and an erring person may be a Catholike. A wicked person in his errour becomes heretick, when the good man in the same errour shall have all the rewards of Faith. For whatever an ill man believes, if he therefore believe it because it serves his own ends, be his belief true or false, the man hath an hereticall minde, for to serve his own ends, his minde is prepared to believe a lie. But a good man that believes what according to his light, and upon the use of his morall industry he thinks true, whether he hits upon the right or no, because he hath a minde desirous of truth, and prepared

Adv. hæres. c. 11.

prepared to believe every truth, is therefore acceptable to God, because nothing hindred him from it, but what hee could not help, his misery and his weakneſſe, which being imperfections meerly naturall, which God never puniſhes, he ſtands faire for a bleſſing of his morality, which God alwayes accepts. So that now if *Stephen* had followed the example of God Almighty, or retained but the ſame peaceable ſpirit which his Brother of *Carthage* did, he might with more advantage to truth, and reputation both of wiſdome and piety have done his duty in aſſerting what he believ'd to be true; for we are as much bound to be zealous purſuers of peace as earneſt contenders for the Faith. I am ſure more earneſt we ought to be for the peace of the Church, then for an Article which is not of the Faith, as this Queſtion of re-baptization was not; for S. *Cyprian* died in beliefe againſt it, and yet was a Catholike, and a Martyr for the Chriſtian Faith.

The ſumme is this S. *Cyprian* did right in a wrong cauſe (as it hath been ſince judged) and *Stephen* did ill in a good cauſe; as farre then as piety and charity is to be preferr'd before a true opinion, ſo farre is S. *Cyprian*'s practiſe a better precedent for us, and an example of primitive ſanctity, then the zeale and indiſcretion of *Stephen*: S. *Cyprian* had not learn'd to forbid to any one a liberty of propheſying or interpretation, if hee tranſgreſſed not the foundation of Faith and the Creed of the Apoſtles. *Numb.* 23.

Well thus it was, and thus it ought to be in the firſt Ages, the Faith of Chriſtendome reſted ſtill upon the ſame foundation, and the judgements of hereſies were accordingly, or were amiſſe; but the firſt great violation of this truth was, when Generall Councels came in, and the Symbols were enlarged, and new Articles were made as much of neceſſity to be believed as the Creed of the Apoſtles, and damnation threatned to them that did diſſent, and at laſt the Creeds multiplyed in number, and in Articles, and the liberty of propheſying began to be ſomething reſtrained. *Numb.* 24.

And this was of ſo much the more force and efficacy becauſe it began upon great reaſon, and in the firſt inſtance, with ſucceſſe good enough. For I am much pleaſed with the en- *Numb.* 25.

larging of the Creed, which the Councell of *Nice* made, because they enlarged it to my sense; but I am not sure that others are satisfied with it; While we look upon the Article they did determine, we see all things well enough; but there are some wise personages consider it in all circumstances, and think the Church had been more happy if she had not been in some sense constrain'd to alter the simplicity of her faith, and make it more curious and articulate, so much that he had need be a subtle man to understand the very words of the new determinations.

Numb. 26. For the first *Alexander* Bishop of *Alexandria*, in the presence of his Clergy, entreats somewhat more curiously of the Socra. l. 1. c. 8. secret of the mysterious Trinity and Unity, so curiously, that *Arius* (who was a Sophister too subtle as it afterward appear'd) misunderstood him, and thought he intended to bring in the heresy of *Sabellius*. For while he taught the Unity of the Trinity, either he did it so inartificially, or so intricately, that *Arius* thought he did not distinguish the persons, when the Bishop intended only the unity of nature. Against this *Arius* furiously drives, and to confute *Sabellius*, and in him (as he thought) the Bishop, distinguishes the natures too, and so to secure the Article of the Trinity, destroyes the Unity. It was the first time the Question was disputed in the world, and in such mysterious niceties, possibly every wise man may understand something, but few can understand all, and therefore suspect what they understand not, and are furiously zealous for that part of it which they doe perceive. Well, it hapned in these as alwayes in such cases, in things men understand not they are most impetuous; and because suspition is a thing infinite in degrees, for it hath nothing to determine it, a suspitious person is ever most violent; for his feares are worse then the thing feared, because the thing is limited, but his feares Lib. 1. c. 6. are not; so that upon this grew contentions on both sides, and tumults, rayling and reviling each other; and then the Laity were drawn into parts, and the *Meletians* abetted the wrong part, and the right part fearing to be overborn, did any thing that was next at hand to secure it selfe. Now then they that lived in that Age, that understood the men, that saw how quiet

the

the Church was before this ſtirre, how miſerably rent now, what little benefit from the Queſtion, what ſchiſme about it, gave other cenſures of the buſineſſe, then we ſince have done, who only look upon the Article determind with truth and approbation of the Church generally, ſince that time. But the Epiſtle of *Conſtantine* to *Alexander* and *Arius*, tells the truth, and Cap. 7. chides them both for commencing the Queſtion, *Alexander* for broaching it, *Arius* for taking it up; and although this be true, that it had been better for the Church it never had begun, yet being begun, what is to be done in it? of this alſo in that admirable Epiſtle, we have the Emperours judgement (I ſuppoſe not without the adviſe and privity of *Hoſius* Biſhop of *Corduba*, whom the Emperour lov'd and truſted much, and imployed in the delivery of the Letters.) "For firſt he calls it a certain vain piece of a Queſtion, ill begun and more unadviſedly publiſhed, a Queſtion which no Law or Eccleſiaſticall Canon defineth, a fruitleſſe contention, the product of idle braines, a matter ſo nice, ſo obſcure, ſo intricate that it was neither to be explicated by the Clergy, nor underſtood by the people, a diſpute of words, a doctrine inexplicable, but moſt dangerous when taught leaſt it introduce diſcord or blaſphemy; and therefore, the Objector was raſh, and the anſwerer unadviſed; for it concernd not the ſubſtance of Faith, or the worſhip of God, nor any cheiſe commandment of Scripture, and therefore, why ſhould it be the matter of diſcord? For though the matter be grave; yet becauſe neither neceſſary, nor explicable, the contention is trifling and toyiſh. And therefore, as the Philoſophers of the ſame Sect, though differing in explication of an opinion, yet more love for the unity of their Profeſſion, then diſagree for the difference of opinion; So ſhould Chriſtians believing in the ſame God, retaining the ſame Faith, having the ſame hopes, oppoſed by the ſame enemies, not fall at variance upon ſuch diſputes, conſidering our underſtandings are not all alike; and therefore, neither can our opinions in ſuch myſterious Articles: ſo that the matter being of no great importance, but vaine, and a toy in reſpect of the excellent bleſſings of peace and charity, it were good that *Alexander* and *Arius* ſhould leave contending, keep"

" keep their opinions to themſelves, ask each other forgiveneſſe, " and give mutuall toleration. This is the ſubſtance of *Conſtantine*'s letter, and it contains in it much reaſon, if he did not undervalue the Queſtion; but it ſeems it was not then thought a Queſtion of Faith, but of nicety of diſpute; they both did believe one God, and the holy Trinity. Now then that he afterward called the *Nicene* Councell, it was upon occaſion of the vileneſſe of the men of the *Arian* part, their eternall diſcord and pertinacious wrangling, and to bring peace into the Church; that was the neceſſity; and in order to it was the determination of the Article. But for the Article it ſelfe, the Letter declares what opinion he had of that, and this Letter was by *Socrates* called *a wonderfull exhortation, full of grace and ſober councels*; and ſuch as *Hoſius* himſelf, who was the meſſenger, preſſed with all earneſtneſſe, with all the skill and Authority he had.

Numb. 27. I know the opinion the world had of the Article afterward is quite differing from this cenſure given of it before; and therefore they have put it into the Creed (I ſuppoſe) to bring the world to unity, and to prevent Sedition in this Queſtion, and the accidentall blaſphemies, which were occaſioned by their curious talkings of ſuch ſecret myſteries, and by their illiterate reſolutions. But although the Article was determin'd with an excellent ſpirit, and we all with much reaſon profeſſe to believe it; yet it is another conſideration, whether or no it might not have been better determin'd, if with more ſimplicity; and another yet, whether or no ſince many of the Biſhops who did believe this thing, yet did not like the nicety and curioſity of expreſſing it, it had not been more agreeable to the practiſe of the Apoſtles to have made a determination of the Article by way of Expoſition of the Apoſtles Creed, and to have left this in a reſcript, for record to all poſterity, and not to have enlarged the Creed with it; for ſince it was an Explication of an Article of the Creed of the Apoſtles, as Sermons are of places of Scripture, it was thought by ſome, that Scripture might with good profit, and great truth be expounded, and yet the expoſitions not put into the Canon, or goe for Scripture, but that left ſtill in the naked Originall ſimplicity, and ſo much the

rather

rather ſince that Explication was further from the foundation, and though moſt certainly true, yet not penn'd by ſo infallible a ſpirit, as was that of the Apoſtles; and therefore not with ſo much evidence, as certainty. And if they had pleaſed, they might have made uſe of an admirable precedent to this and many other great and good purpoſes, no leſſe then of the bleſſed Apoſtles, whoſe Symbol they might have imitated, with as much ſimplicity as they did the Expreſſions of Scripture, when they firſt compoſed it. For it is moſt conſiderable, that although in reaſon, every clauſe in the Creed ſhould be clear, and ſo inopportune and unapt to variety of interpretation, that there might be no place left for ſeverall ſenſes or variety of Expoſitions: yet when they thought fit to inſert ſome myſteries into the Creed, which in Scripture were expreſſed in ſo myſterious words, that the laſt and moſt explicite ſenſe would ſtill be latent, yet they who (if ever any did) underſtood all the ſenſes and ſecrets of it, thought it not fit to uſe any words but the words of Scripture, particularly in the Articles of [Chriſts deſcending into Hell, and ſitting at the right hand of God] to ſhew us, that thoſe Creeds are beſt which keep the very words of Scripture; and that Faith is beſt which hath greateſt ſimplicity, and that it is better in all caſes humbly to ſubmit, then curiouſly to enquire and pry into the myſtery under the cloud, and to hazard our Faith by improving our knowledge: If the *Nicene* Fathers had done ſo too, poſſibly the Church would never have repented it.

And indeed the experience, the Church had afterwards, ſhewed that the Biſhops and Prieſts were not ſatisfied in all circumſtances, nor the ſchiſm appeaſed, nor the perſons agreed, nor the Canons accepted, nor the Article underſtood, nor any thing right, but when they were overborn with Authority, which Authority when the ſcales turned, did the ſame ſervice and promotion to the contrary. *Numb.* 28.

But it is conſiderable, that it was not the Article or the thing it ſelfe that troubled the diſagreeing perſons, but the manner of repreſenting it. For the five Diſſenters, *Euſebius* of *Nicomedia*, *Theognis*, *Maris*, *Theonas*, and *Secundus*, believed Chriſt to be very God of very God, but the clauſe of ὁμοούσιος they *Numb.* 29.

they derided as being perswaded by their Logick, that he was neither of the substance of the Father, by division as a piece of a lump, nor derivation as children from their Parents, nor by production as buds from trees, and no body could tell them any other way at that time, and that made the fire to burn still. And that was it I said; if the Article had been with more simplicity, and lesse nicety determin'd; charity would have gain'd more, and faith would have lost nothing. And we shall finde the wisest of them all, for so *Eusebius Pamphilus* was esteem'd, published a Creed or Confession in the Synod, and though he and all the rest believed that great mystery of Godlinesse, *God manifested in the flesh*, yet he was not fully satisfied, nor so soone of the clause of *one substance*, till he had done a little violence to his own understanding; for even when he had subscribed to the clause of *one substance*, he does it with a protestation, that *heretofore he never had been acquainted nor accustomed himselfe to such speeches.* And the sense of the word was either so ambiguous, or their meaning so uncertain that *Andreas Tricius* does with some probability dispute that the *Nicene* Fathers by ὁμοούσιον, did meane *Patris similitudinem, non essentiæ unitatem, Sylva. 4. c. 1.* And it was so well understood by personages disinterested, that when *Arius* and *Eunoius* had confessed Christ to be *Deus verbum*, without inserting the clause of *one substance*, the Emperour by his Letter approv'd of his Faith, and restor'd him to his Countrey and Office, and the Communion of the Church. And along time after although the Article was believed with * nicety enough, yet when they added more words still to the mystery, and brought in the word ὑπόστασις, saying there were three hypostases in the holy Trinity; it was so long before it could be understood, that it was believed therefore, because they would not oppose their Superiours, or disturb the peace of the Church, in things which they thought could not be understood: in so much that S. *Hierom* writ to *Damasus*, in these words: *Discerne si placet obsecro, non timebo tres hypostases dicere, si jubetis*; and againe, *Obtestor beatitudinem tuam per Crucifixum, mundi salutem, per* ὁμοούσιον *Trinitatem, ut mihi Epistolis tuis, sive tacendarum sive dicendarum hypostasεὸn detur authoritas.*

Vide Sozomen. lib. 2. c. 18.

Socrat. lib. 1. cap. 26.

* Non imprudenter dixi, qui curiosæ explicationi hujus mysterii dictum Aristonis Philosophi applicuit, Helleborus niger si crassius sumatur purgat & sanat. Quum autem teritur & comminuitur, suffocat.

But

But without all Queſtion, the Fathers determin'd the Queſtion with much truth, though I cannnot ſay, the Arguments upon which they built their Decrees, were ſo good as the concluſion it ſelfe was certain; But that which in this caſe is conſiderable, is whether or no they did well in putting a curſe to the foot of their Decree, and the Decree it ſelfe into the Symbol, as if it had been of the ſame neceſſity? For the curſe, *Euſebius Pamphilus* could hardly finde in his heart to ſubſcribe, at laſt he did; but with this clauſe that he ſubſcribed it becauſe the forme of curſe did only *forbid men to acquaint themſelves with forraign ſpeeches and unwritten languages,* whereby confuſion and diſcord is brought into the Church. So that it was not ſo much a magiſteriall high aſſertion of the Article, as an endeavour to ſecure the peace of the Church. And to the ſame purpoſe for ought I know, the Fathers compoſed a Form of Confeſſion, not as a preſcript Rule of Faith to build the hopes of our ſalvation on but as a *teſſera* of that Communion which by publike Authority was therefore eſtabliſhed upon thoſe Articles becauſe the Articles were true, though not of prime neceſſity, and becauſe that unity of confeſſion was judg'd, as things then ſtood, the beſt preſerver of the unity of minds. *Numb.* 30.

But I ſhall obſerve this, that although the *Nicene* Fathers in that caſe at that time, and in that conjuncture of circumſtances did well (and yet their approbation is made by after Ages *ex poſt facto)* yet if this precedent had been followed by all Councels (and certainly they had equall power, if they had thought it equally reaſonable) and that they had put all their Decrees into the Creed, as ſome have done ſince, to what a volume had the Creed by this time ſwell'd? and all the houſe had run into foundation, nothing left for ſuper-ſtructures. But that they did not, it appeares 1 that ſince they thought all their Decrees true, yet they did not think them all neceſſary, at leaſt not in that degree, and that they publiſhed ſuch Decrees, they did it *declarando,* not *imperando,* as Doctors in their Chaires, not maſters of other mens faith and conſciences. 2 And yet there is ſome more modeſty, or warineſſe or neceſſity (what ſhall I call it?) then this comes too: for why are *Numb.* 31. 1. 2.

not all controverſies determin'd? but even when Generall Aſſemblies of Prelates have been, ſome controverſies that have been very vexatious, have been pretermitted, and others of leſſe conſequence have been determind: Why did never any Generall Councell condemn in expreſſe ſentence the *Pelagian* hereſy, that great peſt, that ſubtle infection of Criſtendome? and yet divers Generall Councells did aſſemble while the hereſy was in the world. Both theſe caſes in ſeverall degrees leave men in their liberty of believing and propheſying. The latter proclaimes that all controverſies cannot be determind to ſufficient purpoſes, and the firſt declares that thoſe that are, are not all of them matters of Faith, and themſelves are not ſo ſecure, but they may bee deceived; and therefore poſſibly it were better it were let alone; for if the latter leaves them divided in their opinions, yet their Communions, and therefore probably their charities are not divided; but the former divides their Communions, and hinders their intereſt; and yet for ought is certain, the accuſed perſon is the better Catholike. And yet after all this, it is not ſafety enough to ſay, let the Councell or Prelates determine Articles warily, ſeldome, with great caution, and with much ſweetneſſe and modeſty. For though this be better then to doe it raſhly, frequently and furiouſly; yet if we once tranſgreſſe the bounds ſet us by the Apoſtles in their Creed, and not onely preach other truths, but determine them *pro tribunali* as well as *pro cathedra*, although there be no errour in the ſubject matter (as in *Nice* there was none) yet if the next Ages ſay they will determine another Article with as much care and caution, and pretend as great a neceſſity, there is no hindring them, but by giving reaſons againſt it; and ſo like enough they might have done againſt the decreeing the Article at *Nice*; yet that is not ſufficient; for ſince the Authority of the *Nicene* Councell hath grown to the heigth of a mountainous prejudice againſt him that ſhould ſay it was ill done, the ſame reaſon and the ſame neceſſity may be pretended by any Age and in any Councell, and they think themſelves warranted by the great precedent at *Nice*, to proceed as peremptorily as they did; but then if any other Aſſembly of learned men may poſſibly

possibly be deceiv'd, were it not better they should spare the labour, then that they should with so great pomp and solennities engage mens perswasions, and determine an Article which after Ages must rescind; for therefore most certainly in their own Age, the point with safety of faith and salvation, might have been disputed and disbelieved: And that many mens faiths have been tyed up by Acts and Decrees of Councels for those Articles in which the next Age did see a liberty had better beene preserved, because an errour was determined, wee shall afterward receive a more certaine account.

And therefore the Councell of *Nice* did well, and *Constantinople* did well, so did *Ephesus* and *Chalcedon*; but it is because the Articles were truly determin'd (for that is part of my belief;) but who is sure it should be so before hand, and whether the points there determin'd were necessary or no to be believ'd or to be determin'd, if peace had been concern'd in it through the faction and division of the parties, I suppose the judgement of *Constantine* the Emperour and the famous *Hosius* of *Corduba* is sufficient to instruct us, whose authority I rather urge then reasons, because it is a prejudice and not a reason I am to contend against. *Numb.* 32.

So that such determinations and publishing of Confessions with Authority of Prince and Bishop, are sometimes of very good use for the peace of the Church, and they are good also to determine the judgement of indifferent persons, whose reasons of either side, are not too great to weigh down the probability of that Authority: But for persons of confident and imperious understandings, they on whose side the determination is, are armed with a prejudice against the other, and with a weapon to affront them, but with no more to convince them; and they against whom the decision is, doe the more readily betake themselves to the defensive, and are engaged upon contestation and publike enmities, for such Articles which either might safely have been unknown, or with much charity disputed. Therefore the *Nicene* Councell, although it have the advantage of an acquir'd and prescribing Authority, yet it must not become a precedent to others, least the inconveniences of *Numb.* 33.

multiplying more Articles upon as great pretence of reason as then, make the act of the *Nicene* Fathers in straightning Prophesying, and enlarging the Creed, become accidentally an inconvenience. The first restraint, although if it had been complaind of, might possibly have been better consider'd of, yet the inconvenience is not visible, till it comes by way of precedent to usher in more. It is like an Arbitrary power, which although by the same reason it take six pence from the subject, it may take a hundred pound, and then a thousand, and then all, yet so long as it is within the first bounds, the inconvenience is not so great; but when it comes to be a precedent or argument for more, then the first may justly be complaind of, as having in it that reason in the principle, which brought the inconvenience in the sequell; and we have seen very ill consequents from innocent beginnings.

Numb. 34. And the inconveniences which might possibly arise from this precedent, those wise Personages also did fore-see, and therefore although they took liberty in *Nice*, to adde some Articles, or at least more explicitely to declare the first Creed, yet they then would have all the world to rest upon that and goe no farther, as believing that to be sufficient. S. *Athanasius* declares their opinion, Epist. ad Epict. ... That Faith which those Fathers there confessed, was sufficient for the refutation of all impiety, and the establishment of all Faith in Christ and true Religion. And therefore there was a famous Epistle written by *Zeno* the Emperour, called the Euagr. l. 3. c. 14. ... or the Epistle of reconciliation, in which all disagreeing interests, are entreated to agree in the *Nicene* Symbol, and a promise made upon that condition to communicate with all other Sects, adding withall, that the Church should never receive any other Symbol then that which was compos'd by the *Nicene* Fathers. And however *Honorius* was condemnd for a *Monothelite*; yet in one of the Epistles which the sixth Synod alledged against him, (*viz.* the second) he gave them counsell that would have done the Church as much service as the determination of the Article did; for he advised them not to be curious

curious in their diſputings, nor dogmaticall in their determinations about that Queſtion; and becauſe the Church was not uſed to diſpute in that Queſtion, it were better to preſerve the ſimplicity of Faith, then to enſnare mens conſciences by a new Article. And when the Emperour *Conſtantius* was by his Faction engaged in a contrary practiſe, the inconvenience and unreaſonableneſſe was ſo great, that a prudent Heathen obſerved and noted it in this character of *Conſtantius*, *Chriſtianam religionem abſolutam & ſimplicem* [N.B.] *anili ſuperſtitione confudit. In quâ ſcrutandâ perplexiùs quam in componendâ gratiùs, excitavit diſſidia quæ progreſſa fuſiùs aluit concertatione verborum dum ritum omnem ad ſuum trahere conatur arbitrium.* Am. Marcellin. l. 21. fin.

And yet men are more lead by Example then either by Reaſon or by Precept; for in the Councell of *Conſtantinople* one Article *de novo & integro* was added, viz. *I believe one Baptiſm for the remiſſion of ſinnes*; and then againe they were ſo confident, that that Confeſſion of Faith was ſo abſolutely intire, and that no man ever after ſhould neede to adde any thing to the integrity of Faith, that the Fathers of the Councell of *Epheſus* pronounced Anathema to all thoſe that ſhould adde any thing to the Creed of *Conſtantinople*. And yet for all this, the Church of *Rome* in a Synod at *Gentilly* added the clauſe of *Filioque*, to the Article of the proceſſion of the holy Ghoſt, and what they have done ſince, all the world knowes, *Exempla non conſiſtunt, ſed quamvis in tenuem recepta tramitem, latiſſimè evagandi ſibi faciunt poteſtatem.* All men were perſwaded that it was moſt reaſonable the limits of Faith ſhould be no more enlarged; but yet they enlarged it themſelves, and bound others from doing it, like an intemperate Father, who becauſe he knowes he does ill himſelfe, enjoyns temperance to his Son, but continues to be intemperate himſelfe. *Numb.* 35.

But now if I ſhould be queſtioned concerning the Symbol of *Athanaſius* (for we ſee the *Nicene* Symbol was the Father of many more, ſome twelve or thirteen Symbols in the ſpace of a hundred years) I confeſſe I cannot ſee that moderate ſentence and gentleneſſe of charity in his Preface and Concluſion as there was in the *Nicene* Creed. Nothing there but damnation *Numb.* 36.

and perishing everlastingly, unlesse the Article of the Trinity be believed, as it is there with curiosity and minute particularities explaind. Indeed *Athanasius* had been soundly vexed on one side, and much cryed up on the other; and therefore it is not so much wonder for him to be so decretory and severe in his censure; for nothing could more ascertain his friends to him, and dis-repute his enemies, then the belieſe of that damnatory Appendix; but that does not justifie the thing. For the Articles themselves, I am most heartily perswaded of the truth of them, and yet I dare not say all that are not so, are irrevocably damnd, because *citra hoc Symbolum*, the Faith of the Apostles Creed is intire, and he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, that is, he that believeth such a belieſe as is sufficient disposition to be baptized, that Faith with the Sacrament is sufficient for heaven. Now the Apostles Creed does one; why therefore doe not both intitle us to the promise? Besides, if it were considered concerning *Athanasius* Creed, how many people understand it not, how contrary to naturall reason it seems, how little the * Scripture sayes of those curiosities of Explication, and how Tradition was not cleare on his side for the Article it selfe, much lesse for those formes and minutes (how himselfe is put to make an answer, and excuse for the † Fathers speaking in favour of the *Arrians*, at least so seemingly, that the *Arrians* appeald to them for tryall, and the offer was declind) and after all this that the *Nicene* Creed it selfe went not so farre, neither in Article, nor Anathema nor Explication, it had not been amisse if the finall judgement had been left to Jesus Christ; for he is appointed Judge of all the World, and he shall Judge the people righteously, for he knowes every truth, the degree of every necessity, and all excuses that doe lessen, or take away the nature or malice of a crime; all which I think *Athanasius* though a very good man, did not know so well as to warrant such a sentence. And put case the heresy there condemnd be damnable, (as it is damnable enough) yet a man may maintain an

* Vide Hosium de author. S. Scrip. l. 3. p. 53. & Gordon. Hunlæum. Tom. 1. controv. 1. de verbo Dei, cap. 19.

† Vide Gretser. & Tanner. in coloq. Ratisbon. Eusebium fuisse Arrianum ait Perron. lib. 3. cap. 2 contre le Roy Iaques. Idem ait Originem negasse Divinitatem filii & Spir. S. l. 2. c. 7. de Euchar. contra. Duplessis. idem cap. 5. observ. 4. ait. Irenæum talia dixisse quæ qui hodiè diceret, pro Arriano reputaretur; vide etiam Fisher. in resp. ad 9. Quæst. Iacobi Reg. & Epiphan. in hæres. 69.

an opinion that is in it selfe damnable, and yet he not knowing it so, and being invincibly lead into it may goe to heaven; his opinion shall burn, and himselfe be saved. But however, I finde no opinions in Scripture cald damnable, but what are impious *in materiâ practicâ*, or directly destructive of the Faith or the body of Christianity, such of which S. *Peter* speaks [*bringing in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, these are the false Prophets who out of covetousnesse make merchandise of you through cozening words.*] Such as these are truly heresies, and such as these are certainly damnable. But because there are no degrees either of truth or falshood, every true proposition being alike true; that an errour is more or lesse damnable, is not told us in Scripture, but is determind by the man and his manners, by circumstance and accidents; and therefore the censure in the Preface and end, are Arguments of his zeal and strength of his perswasion; but they are extrinsecall and accidentall to the Articles, and might as well have been spared. And indeed to me it seems very hard to put uncharitableness into the Creed, and so to make it become as an Article of Faith, though perhaps this very thing was no Faith of *Athanasius* who if we may believe *Aquinas*, made this manifestation of Faitth, *non per modum Symboli, sed per modum doctrinæ*, that is, if I understood him right, not with a purpose to impose it upon others, but with confidence to declare his own beliefe; and that it was prescrib'd to others as a Creed, was the act of the Bishops of *Rome*; so he said, nay, possibly it was none of his: So said the Patriarch of C.P. *Meletius* about one hundred and thirty years since, in his Epistle to *John Donza*, *Athanasio falsò adscriptum Symbolum cum Pontificum Rom. appendice illâ adulteratum, luce lucidiùs contestamur.* And it is more then probable that he said true, because this Creed was written originally in Latine, which in all reason *Athanasius* did not, and it was translated into Greek, it being apparent that the Latine Copy is but one, but the Greek is various, there being three Editions or Translations rather, expressed by *Genebrard, lib. 3. de Trinit.* But in this particular, who list, may better satisfie himselfe in a disputation *de Symbolo Athanasii*, printed at *Wertzburg* 1590 supposed to be written by *Serrarius* or *Clensherus*.

2 Pet. 2. 1.

D. Tho. 2. 2. q. 1. artic. 10. ad 3um.

And

Numb. 37. And yet I muſt obſerve that this Symbol of *Athanaſius* and that other of *Nice*, offer not at any new Articles; they only pretend to a further Explication of the Articles Apoſtolicall, which is a certain confirmation that they did not believe more Articles to be of belief neceſſary to ſalvation: if they intended theſe further Explications to be as neceſſary as the dogmaticall Articles of the Apoſtles Creed, I know not how to anſwer all that may be objected againſt that; but the advantage that I ſhall gather from their not proceeding to new matters, is laid out ready for me in the words of *Athanaſius*, ſaying of this Creed [*this is the Catholike Faith*] and if his authority bee good, or his ſaying true, or he the Authour, then no man can ſay of any other Article, that it is a part of the Catholike Faith, or that the Catholike Faith can be enlarged beyond the contents of that Symbol; and therefore it is a ſtrange boldneſſe in the Church of *Rome*, firſt to adde twelve new Articles, and then to adde the Appendix of *Athanaſius* to the end of them, *This is the Catholike Faith, without which no man can be ſaved.*

Bulla Pii quarti ſupra forma juramenti profeſſionis fidei, in fin. Conc. Trident.

Numb. 38. But ſo great an example of ſo excellent a man, hath been either miſtaken or followed with too much greedineſſe, all the world in factions, all damning one another, each party damnd by all the reſt, and there is no diſagreeing in opinion from any man that is in love with his own opinion, but damnation preſently to all that diſagree. A Ceremony and a Rite hath cauſed ſeverall Churches to Excommunicate each other, as in the matter of the Saturday Faſt, and keeping Eaſter. But what the ſpirits of men are when they are exaſperated in a Queſtion and difference of Religion, as they call it, though the thing it ſelfe may be moſt inconſiderable, is very evident in that requeſt of Pope *Innocent* the Third, deſiring of the Greeks (but reaſonably a man would think) that they would not ſo much hate the Roman manner of conſecrating in unleavened bread, as to waſh, and ſcrape, and pare the Altars after a Roman Prieſt had conſecrated. Nothing more furious than a miſtaken zeal, and the actions of a ſcrupulous and abuſed conſcience. When men think every thing to be their Faith and their Religion, commonly they are ſo buſie in trifles and ſuch impertinencies in

which

which the scene of their mistake lies, that they neglect the greater things of the Law, charity, and compliances, and the gentleness of Christian Communion; for this is the great principle of mischiefe, and yet is not more pernicious then unreasonable.

For I demand: Can any man say and justifie that the Apostles did deny Communion to any man that believed the Apostles Creed, and liv'd a good life? And dare any man taxe that proceeding of remissenesse, and indifferency in Religion? And since our blessed Saviour promised salvation to him that *believeth* (and the Apostles when they gave this word the greatest extent, enlarged it not beyond the borders of the Creed) how can any man warrant the condemning of any man to the flames of Hell that is ready to die in attestation of this Faith, so expounded and made explicite by the Apostles, and lives accordingly? And to this purpose it was excellently said by a wise and a pious Prelate, S. *Hilary*, *Non per difficiles nos Deus ad beatam vitam quæstiones vocat, &c. In absoluto nobis & facili est æternitas; Jesum suscitatum à mortuis, per Deum credere, & ipsum esse Dominum confiteri, &c.* These are the Articles which we must believe, which are the sufficient and adequate object of that Faith which is required of us in order to Salvation. And therefore it was, that when the Bishops of *Istria* deserted the Communion of Pope *Pelagius*, *in causâ trium Capitulorum*, he gives them an account of his Faith by recitation of the Creed, and by attesting the four Generall Councels, and is confident upon this that *de fidei firmitate nulla poterit esse quæstio vel suspicio generari*; let the Apostles Creed, especially so explicated, be but secured, and all Faith is secured; and yet that explication too, was lesse necessary then the Articles themselves; for the explication was but accidentall, but the Articles even before the Explication were accounted a sufficient inlet to the Kingdome of heaven.

Numb. 39.

L. 10. de Trin. ad finem.

Concil. tom. 4. Edit. Paris. p. 473.

And that there was security enough, in the simple believing the first Articles, is very certain amongst them, and by their Principles who allow of an implicite faith to serve most persons to the greatest purposes; for if the Creed did contain in it the whole Faith, and that other Articles were in it implicitely,

Numb. 40.

(for such is the doctrine of the Schoole, and particularly of *Aquinas*) then he that explicitely believes all the Creed, does implicitely believe all the Articles contain'd in it, and then it is better the implication should still continue, then that by any explication (which is simply unnecessary) the Church should be troubled with questions, and uncertain determinations, and factions enkindled, and animosities set on foot, and mens soules endanger'd, who before were secur'd by the explicite beliefe of all that the Apostles requir'd as necessary, which beliefe also did secure them for all the rest, because it implied the belief of whatsoever was virtually in the first Articles, if such beliefe should by chance be necessary.

22ª. q. 2. 10. ca. 2.

Numb. 41. The summe of this discourse is this, if we take an estimate of the nature of Faith from the dictates and promises Evangelicall, and from the practice Apostolicall, the nature of Faith and its integrity consists in such propositions which make the foundation of hope and charity, that which is sufficient to make us to doe honour to Christ, and to obey him, and to encourage us in both; and this is compleated in the Apostles Creed. And since contraries are of the same extent, heresy is to be judg'd by its proportion and analogy to faith, and that is heresy only which is against Faith. Now because Faith is not only a precept of Doctrines, but of manners and holy life, whatsoever is either opposite to an Article of Creed, or teaches ill life, that's heresy; but all those propositions which are extrinsecall to these two considerations, be they true or be they false, make not heresy, nor the man an Heretick; and therefore however hee may be an erring person, yet he is to be used accordingly, pitied and instructed, not condemned or Excommunicated; And this is the result of the first ground, the consideration of the nature of Faith and heresy.

SECT.

Sect. III.

Of the difficulty and uncertainty of Arguments from Scripture, in Queſtions not ſimply neceſſary, not literally determined.

God who diſpoſes of all things ſweetly and according to the nature and capacity of things and perſons, had made thoſe only neceſſary, which he had taken care ſhould be ſufficiently propounded to all perſons of whom he required the explicite beliefe. And therefore all the Articles of Faith are cleerely and plainly ſet down in Scripture, and the Goſpel is not hid *niſi pereuntibus* ſaith S. *Paul*; πόσης γὰρ ἀφελῆς παραίνησιν, ἢ κακίας ἀπάτης προφὴν ἐν ταύταις ἐυρίσκομεν, ſaith *Damaſcen*, and that ſo manifeſtly that no man can be ignorant of the foundation of Faith without his own apparent fault. And this is acknowledged by all wiſe and good men, and is evident, beſides the reaſonableneſſe of the thing, in the teſtimonies of Saints [a] *Auſtin*, [b] *Hierome*, [c] *Chryſoſtome*, [d] *Fulgentius*, [e] *Hugo de Sancto Victore*, [f] *Theodoret*, [g] *Lactantius*, [h] *Theophilus Antiochenus*, [i] *Aquinas*, and the latter Schoole men. And God hath done more; for many things which are only profitable, are alſo ſet down ſo plainly, that (as S. *Auſtin* ſayes) *nemo inde haurire non poſſit, ſi modò ad hauriendum devotè ac piè accedat* (*ubi ſupra de util. cred. c. 6.*) but of ſuch things there is no Queſtion commenc'd in Chriſtendome, and if there were, it cannot but be a crime and humane intereſt, that are the Authors of ſuch diſputes, and therefore theſe cannot be ſimple errours, but alwayes hereſies, becauſe the principle of them is a perſonall ſinne. *Numb.* 1.

But beſides theſe things which are ſo plainly ſet down, ſome for doctrine as S. *Paul* ſayes, that is, for Articles and foundation of Faith, ſome for inſtruction, ſome for reproofe, ſome for comfort, that is, in matters practicall and ſpeculative of ſeverall tempers and conſtitutions, there are innumerable places containing in them great myſteries, but yet either ſo enwrapped with a cloud, or ſo darkned with umbrages, or heigthened with expreſſions, or ſo covered with allegories and garments of

Orthod. fidei lib. 4. c. 18.

[a] Super Pſal. 88. & de util. cred. c. 6.

[b] Super Iſa. c. 19 & in Pſal. 86.

[c] Homil. 3. in 1 Theſſ. Ep. 2.

[d] Serm de confeſſ.

[e] Miſcel. 2. l. 1. tit. 46.

[f] In Gen. ap. Struch p. 87.

[g] C. 6. c. 21.

[h] Ad Antioch. l. 2. p. 918.

[i] Par. 1. q. 1. art. 9 *Numb.* 2.

Rhetorick, so profound in the matter, or so altered or made intricate in the manner, in the clothing and in the dressing, that God may seeme to have left them as tryalls of our industry, and Arguments of our imperfections, and incentives to the longings after heaven, and the cleerest revelations of eternity, and as occasions and opportunities of our mutuall charity and toleration to each other, and humility in our selves, rather then the repositories of Faith, and furniture of Creeds, and Articles of belieſe.

Numb. 3. For wherever the word of God is kept, whether in Scripture alone, or also in Tradition, he that considers that the meaning of the one, and the truth or certainty of the other are things of great Question, will see a neceſſity in theſe things (which are the subject matter of most of the Questions of Christendome) that men should hope to be excused by an implicite faith in God Almighty. For when there are in the Explications of Scripture so many Commentaries, so many senses and Interpretations, so many Volumnes in all Ages, and all, like mens faces, exactly none like another, either this difference and inconvenience is absolutely no fault at all, or if it be, it is excusable, by a minde prepar'd to consent in that truth which God intended. And this I call an implicite Faith in God, which is certainly of as great excellency as an implicite Faith in any man or company of men. Because they who doe require an implicite Faith in the Church for Articles leſſe neceſſary, and excuſe the want of explicite Faith by the implicite, doe require an implicite Faith in the Church, because they believe that God hath required of them to have a minde prepared to believe whatever the Church sayes; which because it is a proposition of no absolute certainty, whosoever does in readineſſe of minde believe all that God spake, does also believe that sufficiently, if it be fitting to be believ'd, that is, if it be true, and if God hath said so; for he hath the same obedience of understanding in this as in the other. But because it is not so certain God hath tyed him in all things to believe that which is called the Church, and that it is certain we must believe God in all things, and yet neither know all that either God hath revealed or the Church taught, it is better to take the certain then the uncertain, to believe

believe God rather then men, especially since if God hath bound us to believe men, our absolute submission to God does involve that, and there is no inconvenience in the world this way, but that we implicitely believe one Article more, *viz.* the Churches Authority or infallibility, which may well be pardoned, because it secures our belief of all the rest, and we are sure if we believe all that God said explicitely or implicitely, we also believe the Church implicitely in case we are bound to it; but we are not certain, that if we believe any company of men whom we call the Church, that we therefore obey God and believe what he hath said. But however, if this will not help us, there is no help for us, but good fortune or absolute predestination; for by choyce and industry, no man can secure himself that in all the mysteries of Religion taught in Scripture he shall certainly understand and explicitely believe that sense, that God intended. For to this purpose there are many considerations.

1. There are so many thousands of Copies that were writ by persons of severall interests and perswasions, such different understandings and tempers, such distinct abilities and weaknesses, that it is no wonder there is so great variety of readings both in the Old Testament and in the New. In the Old Testament the Jewes pretend that the Christians have corrupted many places, on purpose to make symphony between both the Testaments. On the other side, the Christians have had so much reason to suspect the Jewes, that when *Aquila* had translated the Bible in their Schooles, and had been taught by them, they rejected the Edition many of them; and some of them called it heresy to follow it. And *Justin Martyr* justified it to *Tryphon*, that the Jewes had detalk'd many sayings from the Books of the old Prophets, and amongst the rest, he instances in that of the Psalm, *Dicite in nationibus quia Dominus regnavit à ligno.* The last words they have cut off, and prevail'd so farre in it, that to this day none of our Bibles have it; but if they ought not to have it, then *Justin Martyrs* Bible had more in it then it should have, for there it was; so that a fault there was either under or over. But however, there are infinite Readings in the New Testament (for in that I will instance) some whole Verses in one that are not in another, and there was in some *Numb.* 2.

Copies of S. *Marks* Goſpel in the laſt Chapter a whole verſe, a Chapter it was anciently called, that is not found in our Bibles, as S. *Hierom. ad Hedibiam*, q. 3. notes. The words he repeats, *Lib. 2. contra Polygamos. Et illi ſatis faciebant dicentes, ſæculum iſtud iniquitatis & incredulitatis ſubſtantia eſt, quæ non ſinit per immundos ſpiritus veram Dei apprehendi virtutem, idcirco jam nunc revela juſtitiam tuam.* Theſe words are thought by ſome, to favour of *Manichaiſme*, and for ought I can finde were therefore rejected out of many Greek Copies, and at laſt out of the Latine: Now ſuppoſe that a *Manichee* in diſputation ſhould urge this place, having found it in his Bible, if a Catholike ſhould anſwer him by ſaying it is Apocryphall, and not found in divers Greek Copies, might not the *Manichee* ask how it came in, if it was not the word of God, and if it was, how came it out? and at laſt take the ſame liberty of rejecting any other Authority which ſhall be alledged againſt him; if he can finde any Copy that may favour him, however that favour be procured; and did not the *Ebionites* reject all the Epiſtles of S. *Paul* upon pretence he was an enemy to the Law of *Moſes?* indeed it was boldly and moſt unreaſonably done; but if one title or one Chapter of S. *Mark* be called Apocryphall, for being ſuſpected of *Manicheiſme*, it is a plea that will too much juſtify others in their taking and chuſing what they liſt. But I will not urge it ſo farre; but is not there as much reaſon for the fierce *Lutherans* to reject the Epiſtle of S. *James* for favouring juſtification by works, or the Epiſtle to the *Hebrewes*, upon pretence that the ſixth and tenth Chapters doe favour *Novatianiſme*; eſpecially ſince it was by ſome famous Churches at firſt not accepted, even by the Church of *Rome* her ſelfe? The Parable of the woman taken in adultery, which is now in *Joh.* 8. *Euſebius* ſayes was not in any Goſpel, but the Goſpel *ſecundum Hebræos*, and S. *Hierom* makes it doubtfull, and ſo does S. *Chryſoſtome* and *Euthimius*, the firſt not vouchſafing to explicate it in Homilies upon S. *John*, the other affirming it not to be found in the exacter Copies. I ſhall not neede to urge that there are ſome words ſo neer in ſound, that the Scribes might eaſily miſtake: There is one famous one of Κυρίῳ & Θεῷ, which yet ſome Copies read

read καίρῳ δικαίοις, the sense is very unlike though the words be neer, and there needs some little luxation to straine this latter reading to a good sense; That famous precept of S. *Paul*, that the women must pray with a covering on their head διὰ τὺς ἀγγέλους, because of the Angels, hath brought into the Church an opinion that Angels are present in Churches, and are Spectators of our devotion and deportment. Such an opinion if it should meet with peevish opposites on one side, and confident Hyperaspists on the other, might possibly make a Sect, and here were a cleer ground for the affirmative, and yet who knowes but that it might have been a mistake of the Transcribers to double the γ? for if it were read διὰ τὺς ἀγέλους, that the sense be, women in publike Assemblies must weare a vaile, by reason of the Companies of the young men there present, it would be no ill exchange for the losse of a letter, to make so probable so cleare a sense of the place. But the instances in this kinde, are too many, as appears in the variety of readings in severall Copies proceeding from the negligence or ignorance of the Transcribers, or the malicious * endeavour of Hereticks, or the inserting Marginall Notes into the Text, or the neereness of severall words. Indeed there is so much evidence of this particular, that it hath encouraged the servants of the Vulgar Translation (for so some are now adayes) to preferre that Translation before the Originall; for although they have attempted that proposition with very ill successe yet that they could think it possible to be prov'd, is an Argument there is much variety and alterations in divers Texts; for if they were not, it were impudence to pretend a Translation, and that none of the best, should be better then the Originall. But so it is that this variety of reading is not of slight consideration; for although it be demonstrably true, that all things necessary to Faith and good manners are preserv'd from alteration and corruption; because they are of things necessary, and they could not be necessary, unlesse they were delivered to us, God in his goodnesse and his justice having oblig'd himself to preserve that which he hath bound us to observe and keep; yet in other things which God hath not oblig'd himselfe so punctually to preserve, in these things since variety of reading is crept in, every reading takes away

* Græci corruperunt novum Testamentum ut testantur Tertul. l. 5. adv. Marcion. Euseb. l. 5. Hist. c. ult. Irenæ. l. 1. c. 29. allu. hæres. Basil. l. 2. contr. Eunomium.

away a degree of certainty from any propoſition derivative from thoſe places ſo read: And if ſome Copies (eſpecially if they be publike and notable) omit a verſe or title, every argument from ſuch a title or verſe loſes much of its ſtrength and reputation; and we finde it in a great inſtance. For when in probation of the myſtery of the glorious Unity in Trinity, we alledge that ſaying of S. *John* [*there are three which bear witneſſe in heaven, the Father, the Word and the Spirit, and theſe three are one*:] the *Antitrinitarians* think they have anſwered the Argument by ſaying the *Syrian* Tranſlation, and divers Greek Copies have not that verſe in them, and therefore being of doubtfull Authority, cannot conclude with certainty in a Queſtion of Faith. And there is an inſtance on the Catholike part. For when the *Arrians* urge the ſaying of our Saviour, [*No man knowes that day and houre* (viz. of Judgement) *no not the Sonne, but the Father only*], to prove that the Sonne knowes not all things, and therefore cannot be God in the proper ſenſe; S. *Ambroſe* thinks he hath anſwered the Argument by ſaying, thoſe words [*no not the Sonne*] was thruſt into the Text by the fraud of the *Arrians*. So that here we have one objection, which muſt firſt be cleared and made infallible, before we can be aſcertain'd in any ſuch Queſtion as to call them Hereticks that diſſent.

Numb. 5. 2. I conſider that there are very many ſenſes and deſigns of expounding Scripture, and when the Grammaticall ſenſe is found out, we are many times never the neerer; it is not that which was intended; for there is in very many Scriptures a double ſenſe, a literall and a Spirituall (for the Scripture is *a Book written within and without* (*Apoc.* 5.) And both theſe ſenſes are ſub-divided. For the literall ſenſe is either naturall or figurative: And the Spirituall is ſometimes allegoricall, ſometimes anogogicall, nay, ſometimes there are divers literall ſenſes in the ſame ſentence, as S. *Auſtin* excellently proves in divers *places, and it appears in divers quotations in the New Teſtament, where the Apoſtles and Divine Writers bring the ſame Teſtimony to divers purpoſes; and particularly, S. *Paul*'s making that ſaying of the Pſalme, *Thou art my Sonne, this day have I begotten thee*, to be an Argument of Chriſts Reſurrection, and

* Lib. 12. confeſſ. cap. 26. Lib. 11. de Civit. Dei. c. 19. Li. 3. de doctrinâ Chriſt. cap. 27.

a

a deſignation or ordination to his Pontificate is an inſtance very famous in his 1. and 5. chapter to the *Hebrewes*. But now there being ſuch variety of ſenſes in Scripture, and but few places ſo mark'd out, as not to be capable of divers ſenſes, if men will write Commentaries, as *Herode* made Orations μὴ πολλῆς φανταϛίας, what infallible κριτήριον will be left whereby to judge of the certain dogmaticall reſolute ſenſe of ſuch places which have been the matter of Queſtion? For put caſe a Queſtion were commenc'd concerning the degrees of glory in heaven, as there is in the Schooles a noted one, To ſhew an inequality of reward, Chriſts Parable is brought of the reward of ten Cities, and of five according to the divers improvement of the Talents; this ſenſe is myſticall, and yet very probable, and underſtood by men for ought I know, to this very ſenſe. And the reſult of the Argument is made good by S. *Paul, as one ſtarre differeth from another in glory*; ſo ſhall it be in the reſurrection of the dead. Now ſuppoſe another ſhould take the ſame liberty of Expounding another Parable to a myſticall ſenſe and Interpretation, as all Parables muſt be expounded; then the Parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard, and though differing in labour, yet having an equall reward, to any mans underſtanding may ſeem very ſtrongly to prove the contrary, and as if it were of purpoſe, and that it were *primum intentum* of the Parable, the Lord of the Vineyard determin'd the point reſolutely upon the mutiny and repining of them that had born the burthen and heat of the day, *I will give unto this laſt even as to thee*; which to my ſenſe ſeems to determine the Queſtion of degrees; They that work but little, and they that work long, ſhall not be diſtinguiſhed in the reward, though accidentally they were in the work: And if this opinion could but anſwer S. *Pauls* words, it ſtands as faire, and perhaps fairer then the other. Now if we look well upon the words of S. *Paul*, we ſhall finde he ſpeaks nothing at all of diverſity of degrees of glory in beatified bodies, but the differences of glory in bodies heavenly and earthly. *There are* (ſayes he) *bodies earthly, and there are heavenly bodies: And one is the glory of the earthly, another the glory of the heavenly; one glory of the Sun, another of the Moone, &c. So ſhall it be in the Reſurrection; for it is*

ſowne in corruption, it is raiſed in incorruption. Plainly thus, our bodies in the Reſurrection ſhall differ as much from our bodies here in the ſtate of corruption, as one Starre does from another. And now ſuppoſe a Sect ſhould be commenc'd upon this Queſtion (upon lighter and vainer many have been) either ſide muſt reſolve to anſwer the others Arguments, whether they can or no, and to deny to each other a liberty of expounding the parable to ſuch a ſenſe, and yet themſelves muſt uſe it or want an Argument. But men uſe to be unjuſt in their own cases; And were it not better to leave each other to their liberty and ſeek to preſerve their own charity? For when the words are capable of a myſticall or a divers ſenſe, I know not why mens fancies or underſtandings ſhould be more bound to be like one another then their faces: And either in all ſuch places of Scripture, a liberty muſt be indulg'd to every honeſt and peaceable wiſe man, or elſe all Argument from ſuch places muſt be wholy declin'd. Now although I inſtanc'd in a Queſtion, which by good fortune never came to open defiance, yet there have been Sects fram'd upon lighter grounds, more inconſiderable Queſtions, which have been diſputed on either ſide with Arguments leſſe materiall and leſſe pertinent. S. *Auſtin* laughs at the *Donatiſts*, for bringing that ſaying of the Spouſe in the *Canticles* to prove their Schiſm, *Indica mihi ubi paſcas, ubi cubes in meridie.* For from thence they concluded the reſidence of the Church was only in the South part of the world, only in *Africa*. It was but a weak way of Argument; yet the Fathers were free enough to uſe ſuch mediums, to prove myſteries of great concernment; but yet againe, when they ſpeak either againſt an Adverſary, or with conſideration, they deny that ſuch myſticall ſenſes can ſufficiently confirm a Queſtion of Faith. But I ſhall inſtance in the great Queſtion of Rebaptization of Hereticks, which many Saints, and Martyrs, and Confeſſors, and divers Councells, and almoſt all *Aſia* and *Africa* did once believe and practiſe. Their grounds for the invalidity of the baptiſm by a Heretick, were ſuch myſticall words as theſe, *Oleum peccatoris non impinguet caput meum* Pſ 140. And *Qui baptizatur à mortuo, quid proficit lavatio ejus? Eccluſ* 34. And *ab aquâ alienâ abſtinete, Prov.* 5. And *Deus peccatores non exaudit,*

Hieron. in Matth. 13.

Joh. 9.

Joh.9. And *he that is not with me is againſt me*, *Luk.*11. I am not ſure the other part had Arguments ſo good. For the great one of *una fides*, *unum baptiſma*, did not conclude it to their underſtandings who were of the other opinion, and men famous in their generations; for it was no Argument that they who had been baptized by *Johns* baptiſm ſhould not be baptized in the name of Jeſus, becauſe *unus Deus*, *unum baptiſma*; and as it is ſtill one Faith which a man confeſſeth ſeverall times, and one Sacrament of the Euchariſt, though a man often communicates; ſo it might be one baptiſm though often miniſtred. And the unity of baptiſm might not be deriv'd from the unity of the miniſtration, but from the unity of the Religion into which they are baptized; though baptized a thouſaud times, yet becauſe it was ſtill in the name of the holy Trinity, ſtill into the death of Chriſt, it might be *unum baptiſma*. Whether S. *Cyprian*, *Firmilian*, and their Collegues had this diſcourſe or no (I know not) I am ſure they might have had much better to have evacuated the force of that Argument, although I believe they had the wrong cauſe in hand. But this is it that I ſay, that when a Queſtion is ſo undetermin'd in Scripture, that the Arguments rely only upon ſuch myſticall places whence the beſt fancies can draw the greateſt variety and ſuch which perhaps were never intended by the holy Ghoſt, it were good the rivers did not ſwell higher then the fountaine, and the confidence higher then the Argument and evidence; for in this caſe there could not any thing be ſo certainly proved, as that the diſagreeing party ſhould deſerve to be condemn'd by a ſentence of Excommunication for diſbelieving it, and yet they were; which I wonder at ſo much the more, becauſe they (who as it was ſince judg'd) had the right cauſe, had not any ſufficient Argument from Scripture, not ſo much as ſuch myſticall Arguments, but did fly to the Tradition of the Church, in which alſo I ſhall afterward ſhew, they had nothing that was abſolutely certaine.

3. I conſider that there are divers places of Scripture containing in them myſteries and Queſtions of great concernment, and yet the fabrick and conſtitution is ſuch, that there is no certain mark to determine whether the ſenſe of them ſhould *Numb.* 6.

be literall or figurative; I speak not here concerning extrinsecall meanes of determination, as traditive Interpretation, Councels, Fathers, Popes, and the like; I shall consider them afterward in their severall places; but here the subject matter being concerning Scripture in its own capacity, I say there is nothing in the nature of the thing to determine the sense and meaning, but it must be gotten out as it can; and that therefore it is unreasonable, that what of it selfe is ambiguous should be understood in its own prime sense and intention, under the paine of either a sinne or an Anathema; I instance in that famous place from whence hath sprung that Question of Transubstantiation, *Hoc est corpus meum.* The words are plain and clear, apt to be understood in the literall sense and yet this sense is so hard as it does violence to reason, and therefore it is the Question whether or no it be not a figurative speech. But here what shall we have to determine it? What mean soever we take, and to what sense soever you will expound it, you shall be put to give an account why you expound other places of Scripture in the same case to quite contrary senses. For if you expound it literally, then besides that it seems to intrench upon the words of our blessed Saviour, *The words that I speak they are Spirit and they are life,* that is, to be spiritually understood (and it is a miserable thing to see what wretched shifts are used to reconcile the literall sense to these words, and yet to distinguish it from the Capernaiticall fancy) but besides this, why are not those other sayings of Christ expounded literally, *I am a Vine, I am the Doore, I am a Rock?* Why doe we flie to a figure in those parallel words? *This is the Covenant which I make between me and you*; and yet that Covenant was but the sign of the Covenant; and why doe we fly to a figure in a precept, as well as in mystery and a proposition? *If thy right hand offend thee cut it off*; and yet we have figures enough to save a limb. If it be said because reason tells us these are not to be expounded according to the letter; This will be no plea for them who retaine the literall exposition of the other instance against all reason, against all Philosophy, against all sense, and against two or three sciences. But if you expound these words figuratively, besides that you are to contest against

a

a world of prejudices you give your selfe the liberty, which if others will use when either they have a reason or a necessity so to doe, they may perhaps turn all into Allegory, and so may evacuate any precept, and elude any Argument. Well, so it is that very wise men have expounded things * Allegorically, when they should have expounded them literally. So did the famous *Origen*, who as S. *Hierom* reports of him, turned Paradise so into an Allegory, that he took away quite the truth of the Story, and not only *Adam* was turned out of the Garden, but the Garden it selfe out of Paradise. Others expound things literally when they should understand them in Allegory; so did the Ancient *Papias* understand (*Apocal.* 20.) Christs Millenary raign upon earth, and so, depressed the hopes of Christianity and their desires to the longing and expectation of temporall pleasures and satisfactions, and he was followed by *Justin Martyr*, *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, *Lactantius*, and indeed the whole Church generally till S. *Austin* and S. *Hierom's* time who first of any whose works are extant did reprove the errour. If such great spirits be deceiv'd in finding out what kinde of senses be to be given to Scriptures, it may well be endur'd that we who sit at their feet, may also tread in the steps of them whose feet could not alwayes tread aright.

4. I consider that there are some places of Scripture that have the selfe same expressions, the same preceptive words, the same reason and account in all appearance, and yet either must be expounded to quite different senses, or else we must renounce the Communion, and the charities of a great part of Christendome. And yet there is absolutely nothing in the thing or in its circumstances, or in its adjuncts that can determine it to different purposes. I instance in those great exclusive negatives for the necessity of both Sacraments. *Nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aquâ &c. Nisi manducaveritis carnem filii hominis, &c.* a *non introibit in regnum cœlorum* for both these. Now then the first is urg'd for the absolute indispensable necessity of baptism even in Infants, insomuch that Infants goe to part of Hell if (inculpably both on their own and their Parents part) they misse of baptism, for that is the doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, which they learnt from S. *Austin*, and others also doe

* Sic S. Hieron. In ad Desiderii provocatus ardore & studio Scripturarum allegoricè interpretatus sum Abdiam Prophetam, cujus historiam nesciebam. *De sensu Allegorico S. Script. dixit Basilius*, ὡς κεκοινωνημένον μὲν τοῦ λόγου ἀποδεχόμεθα, ἀλησθῆ δὲ εἶναι τὸ πᾶν δόκιμον. L. 13. de Civit. Dei, c. 7. præfat. l. 19. in Isai. & in c. 36. Ezek. *Numb.* 7.

doe from hence baptize Infants, though with a lesse opinion of its absolute necessity. And yet the same manner of precept in the same forme of words, in the same manner of threatning, by an exclusive negative, shall not enjoyn us to communicate Infants, though damnation (at least in forme of words) be exactly and *per omnia* alike appendant to the neglect of holy Baptism and the venerable Eucharist. If [*nisi quis renatus*] shall conclude against the Anabaptist, for necessity of baptizing Infants (as sure enough we say, it does) why shall not an equall [*nisi comederitis*] bring Infants to the holy Communion? The Primitive Church for some two whole Ages did follow their own principles, where ever they lead them; and seeing that upon the same ground equall results must follow, they did Communicate Infants as soon as they had baptized them. And why the Church of *Rome* should not doe so too, being she expounds [*nisi comederitis*] of orall manducation, I cannot yet learn a reason. And for others that expound it of a spirituall manducation, why they shall not allow the disagreeing part the same liberty of expounding [*nisi quis renatus*] too, I by no meanes can understand. And in these cases no externall determiner can bee pretended in answer. For whatsoever is extrinsecall to the words, as Councels, Tradition, Church Authority, and Fathers, either have said nothing at all, or have concluded by their practise contrary to the present opinion. as is plaine in their communicating Infants by vertue of [*nisi comederitis.*]

Numb. 8. 5. I shall not need to urge the mysteriousnesse of some points in Scripture, which *ex natura rei* are hard to be understood though very plainly represented. For there are some *secreta Theologiæ*, which are only to be understood by persons very holy and spirituall, which are rather to be felt then discoursed of, and therefore if peradventure they be offered to publike consideration, they will therefore be opposed because they runne the same fortune with many other Questions, that is, not to be understood, and so much the rather because their understanding, that is, the feeling such secrets of the Kingdome, are not the results of Logick and Philosophy, nor yet of publike revelation, but of the publike spirit privately working, and

and in no man is a duty, but in all that have it, is a reward, and is not necessary for all, but given to some, producing its operations, not regularly, but upon occasions, personall necessities and new emergencies. Of this nature are the spirit of obsignation, beliefe of particular salvation, speciall influences and comforts comming from a sense of the spirit of adoption, actuall fervours and great complacencies in devotion spirituall joyes, which are little drawings aside of the curtaines of peace and eternity, and antepasts of immortality. But the not understanding the perfect constitution and temper of these mysteries (and it is hard for any man so to understand, as to make others doe so too that feele them not) is cause that in many Questions of secret Theology, by being very apt and easy to be mistaken, there is a necessity in forbearing one another; and this consideration would have been of good use in the Question between *Soto* and *Catharinus*, both for the preservation of their charity and explication of the mystery.

6. But here it will not be unseasonable to consider, that all systems and principles of science are expressed so that either by reason of the Universality of the termes and subject matter or the infinite variety of humane understandings, and these peradventure swayed by interest, or determin'd by things accidentall and extrinsecall, they seem to divers men, nay to the same men upon divers occasions to speak things extremly disparate and sometimes contrary, but very often of great variety. And this very thing happens also in Scripture; that if it were not in *re sacrâ & seriâ*, it were excellent sport to observe how the same place of Scripture serves severall turns upon occasion; and they at that time believe the words sound nothing else, whereas in the liberty of their judgement and abstracting from that occasion, their Commentaries understand them wholy to a differing sense. It is a wonder of what excellent use to the Church of *Rome*, is [*tibi dabo claves*:] It was spoken to *Peter* and none else (sometimes) and therefore it concerns him and his Successors only; the rest are to derive from him. And yet if you Question them for their Sacrament of Penance, and Priestly Absolution, then *tibi dabo claves* comes in, and that was spoken to S. *Peter*, and in him to the whole Colledge of the Apostles; and *Numb.* 9.

and in them to the whole Hierarchy. If you queſtion why the Pope pretends to free ſoules from Purgatory, *tibi dabo claves* is his warrant; but if you tell him the Keyes are only for binding and looſing on Earth directly, and in Heaven conſequently; and that Purgatory is a part of Hell, or rather neither Earth nor Heaven nor Hell, and ſo the Keyes ſeem to have nothing to doe with it, then his Commiſſion is to be enlarged by a ſuppletory of reaſon and conſequences, and his Keyes ſhall unlock this difficulty; for it is *clavis ſcientiæ* as well as *authoritatis*. And theſe Keyes ſhall enable him to expound Scriptures infallibly, to determine Queſtions, to preſide in Councels, to dictate to all the World Magiſterially, to rule the Church, to diſpence with Oaths, to abrogate Lawes: And if his Key of knowledge will not, the Key of Authority ſhall, and *tibi dabo claves* ſhall anſwer for all. We have an inſtance in the ſingle fancy of one man, what rare variety of matter is afforded from thoſe plain words of [*Oravi pro te Petre*] *Luk.* 22. for that place ſayes *Bellarmine*, is otherwiſe to be underſtood of *Peter*, otherwiſe of the Popes, and otherwiſe of the Church of *Rome*. And [*pro te*] ſignifies that Chriſt prayed that *Peter* might neither erre perſonally nor judicially, and that *Peters* Succeſſors if they did erre perſonally, might not erre judicially, and that the Roman Church might not erre perſonally. All this variety of ſenſe is pretended by the fancy of one man, to be in a few words which are as plain and ſimple as are any words in Scripture. And what then in thoſe thouſands that are intricate? So is done with *paſce oves*, which a man would think were a commiſſion as innocent and guiltleſſe of deſigns, as the ſheep in the folds are. But if it be asked why the Biſhop of *Rome* calls himſelfe Univerſall Biſhop, *paſce oves* is his warrant? Why he pretends to a power of depoſing Princes, *Paſce oves*, ſaid Chriſt to *Peter*, the ſecond time. If it be demanded why alſo he pretends to a power of authorizing his ſubjects to kill him, *Paſce agnos* ſaid Chriſt the third time: And *paſce* is *doce*, and *paſce* is *Impera*, and *paſce* is *occide*. Now if others ſhould take the ſame (unreaſonableneſſe I will not ſay, but the ſame) liberty in expounding Scripture, or if it be not licence taken, but that the Scripture it ſelfe is ſo full and redundant in ſenſes quite contrary, what

Bellar. lib. 2. de Pontif. c. 3. § reſpondeo primò.

man

man ſoever, or what company of men ſoever ſhall uſe this principle, will certainly finde ſuch rare productions from ſeverall places, that either the unreaſonableneſſe of the thing will diſcover the errour of the proceeding, or elſe there will be a neceſſity of permitting a great liberty of judgement, where is ſo infinite variety without limit or mark or neceſſary determination. If the firſt, then becauſe an errour is ſo obvious and ready to our ſelves, it will be great imprudence or tyranny to be haſty in judging others; but if the latter, it is it that I contend for: for it is moſt unreaſonable, when either the thing it ſelfe miniſters variety, or that we take licence to our ſelves in variety of interpretations, or proclaime to all the world our great weakneſſe, by our actually being deceived, that we ſhould either preſcribe to others magiſterially when we are in errour, or limit their underſtandings when the thing it ſelfe affords liberty and variety.

SECT. IV.

Of the difficulty of Expounding Scripture.

THeſe conſiderations are taken from the nature of Scripture it ſelfe; but then if we conſider that we have no certain wayes of determining places of difficulty and Queſtion, infallibly and certainly, but that we muſt hope to be ſav'd in the beliefe of things plaine, neceſſary and fundamentall, and our pious endeavour to finde out Gods meaning in ſuch places which he hath left under a cloud for other great ends reſerved to his own knowledge, we ſhall ſee a very great neceſſity in allowing a liberty in Propheſying without preſcribing authoritatively to other mens conſciences, and becomming Lords and Maſters of their Faith. Now the meanes of expounding Scripture are either externall, or internall. For the externall, as Church Authority, Tradition, Fathers, Councels and Decrees of Biſhops, they are of a diſtinct conſideration, and follow after in their order. But here we will firſt conſider the invalidity and uncertainty of all thoſe meanes of expounding *Numb.* 1.

Scripture which are more proper and internall to the nature of the thing. The great Masters of Commentaries, some whereof have undertaken to know all mysteries, have propounded many wayes to expound Scripture, which indeed are excellent helps, but not infallible assistances, both because themselves are but morall instruments which force not truth *ex abscondito*, as also because they are not infallibly used and applyed. 1. Sometime the sense is drawn forth by the context and connexion of parts: It is well when it can be so. But when there is two or three antecedents, and subjects spoken of, what man or what rule shall ascertain me that I make my reference true by drawing the relation to such an antecedent; to which I have a minde to apply it, another hath not. For in a contexture where one part does not alwayes depend upon another, Where things of differing natures intervene and interrupt the first intentions, there it is not alwayes very probable to expound Scripture, take its meaning by its proportion to the neighbouring words. But who desires satisfaction in this, may read the observation verified in S. *Gregory*'s moralls upon *Job*, lib. 5. c. 29. and the instances he there brings are excellent proofe, that this way of Interpretation does not warrant any man to impose his Expositions upon the beliefe and understanding of other men too confidently and magisterially.

Numb. 2. 2. Another great pretence of medium is the conference of places, which *Illyricus* calls *ingens remedium & felicissimam expositionem sanctæ scripturæ*; and indeed so it is if well and temperately used; but then we are beholding to them that doe so; for there is no rule that can constrain them to it; for comparing of places is of so indefinite capacity, that if there be ambiguity of words, variety of sense, alteration of circumstances, or difference of stile amongst Divine Writers, then there is nothing that may be more abused by wilfull people, or may more easily deceive the unwary, or that may amuse the most intelligent Observer. The Anabaptists take advantage enough in this proceeding, (and indeed so may any one that list) and when we pretend against them the necessity of baptizing all, by authority of *nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aquâ & spiritu*, they have a parallel for it, and tell us that Christ will

will *baptize us with the holy Ghoſt and with fire*, and that one place expounds the other; and becauſe by fire is not meant an Element or any thing that is naturall, but an Allegory and figurative expreſſion of the ſame thing; ſo alſo by water may be meant the figure ſignifying the effect or manner of operation of the holy Spirit. Fire in one place, and water in the other, doe but repreſent to us that Chriſts baptiſm is nothing elſe but the cleanſing and purifying us by the holy Ghoſt; But that which I here note as of greateſt concernment, and which in all reaſon ought to be an utter overthrow to this topique, is an univerſall abuſe of it among thoſe that uſe it moſt, and when two places ſeem to have the ſame expreſſion, or if a word have a double ſignification, becauſe in this place it may have ſuch a ſenſe, therefore it muſt, becauſe in one of the places the ſenſe is to their purpoſe, they conclude that therefore it muſt be ſo in the other too. An inſtance I give in the great Queſtion between the *Socinians* and the Catholikes. If any place be urg'd in which our bleſſed Saviour is called God, they ſhew you two or three where the word God is taken in a depreſſed ſenſe, for a *quaſi Deus*, as when God ſaid to *Moſes*, *Conſtitui te Deum Pharaonis*; and hence they argue, becauſe I can ſhew the word is uſed for a *Deus factus*, therefore no Argument is ſufficient to prove Chriſt to be *Deus verus* from the appellative of *Deus*. And might not another argue to the exact contrary, and as well urge that *Moſes* is *Deus verus*, becauſe in ſome places the word *Deus* is uſed *pro Deo æterno*: Both wayes the Argument concludes impiouſly and unreaſonably. It is a fallacy *a poſſe ad eſſe affirmative*; becauſe breaking of bread is ſometimes uſed for an Euchariſticall manducation in Scripture; therefore I ſhall not from any teſtimony of Scripture affirming the firſt Chriſtians to have broken bread together, conclude that they liv'd hoſpitably and in common ſociety. Becauſe it may poſſibly be eluded, therefore it does not ſignifie any thing. And this is the great way of anſwering all the Arguments that can be brought againſt any thing that any man hath a mind to defend; and any man that reads any controverſies of any ſide, ſhall finde as many inſtances of this vanity almoſt as he finds Arguments from Scripture,

ture; this fault was of old noted by S. *Austin*, for then they had got the trick, and he is angry at it, *neq; enim putare debemus esse præscriptum, ut quod in aliquo loco res aliqua per similitudinem significaverit, hoc etiam semper significare credamus.*

De doctri. Christian. lib. 3.

Numb. 3. 3. Oftentimes Scriptures are pretended to be expounded by a proportion and Analogy of reason. And this is as the other, if it be well, its well. But unlesse there were some *intellectus universalis* furnished with infallible propositions, by referring to which every man might argue infallibly, this Logick may deceive as well as any of the rest. For it is with reason as with mens tastes; although there are some generall principles which are reasonable to all men, yet every man is not able to draw out all its consequences, nor to understand them when they are drawn forth, nor to believe when he does understand them. There is a precept of S. *Paul* directed to the *Thessalonians* before they were gather'd into a body of a Church, 2 *Thes.* 3. 6. *To withdraw from every brother that walketh disorderly.* But if this precept were now observed, I would faine know whether we should not fall into that inconvenience which S. *Paul* sought to avoyd in giving the same commandement to the Church of *Corinth*, 1 *Cor.* 5. 9. *I wrote to you that yee should not company with fornicators*; And *yet not altogether with the fornicators of this world, for then yee must goe out of the world:* And therefore he restrains it to a quitting the society of Christians living ill lives. But now that all the world hath been Christians, if we should sin in keeping company with vitious Christians, must we not also goe out of this world? Is not the precept made null, because the reason is altered, and things are come about, and that the οἱ πολλοὶ are the brethren ἀδέλφοι ὀνόματι λόμενοι called brethren, as S. *Pauls* phrase is? And yet either this never was considered, or not yet believed; for it is generally taken to be obligatory, though (I think) seldome practised. But when we come to expound Scriptures to a certaine sense by Arguments drawn from prudentiall motives, then we are in a vast plain without any sufficient guide, and we shall have so many senses, as there are humane prudences. But that which goes further then this, is a parity of reason from a plain place of Scripture to an obscure, from that which is plainly set down in a Text

to

to another that is more remote from it, And thus is that place in S. *Matthew* forced, *If thy brother refuse to be amended, Dic ecclesiæ.* Hence some of the Roman Doctors argue, If Christ commands to tell the Church in case of adultery or private injury, then much more in case of heresy. Well, suppose this to be a good Interpretation; Why must I stay here? Why may not I also adde by a parity of reason, If the Church must be told of heresy, much more of treason: And why may not I reduce all sinnes to the cognizance of a Church tribunall, as some men doe indirectly, and *Snecanus* does heartily and plainly? If a mans principles be good, and his deductions certain, he need not care whether they carry him. But when an Authority is intrusted to a person, and the extent of his power expressed in his commission, it will not be safety to meddle beyond his commission upon confidence of a parity of reason. To instance once more; When Christ in *pasce oves & tu es Petrus*, gave power to the Pope to govern the Church (for to that sense the Church of *Rome* expounds those Authorities) by a certain consequence of reason, say they, he gave all things necessary for exercise of this jurisdiction, and therefore in *pasce oves*] he gave him an indirect power over temporalls, for that is necessary that he may doe his duty: Well, having gone thus farre, we will goe further upon the parity of reason, therefore he hath given the Pope the gift of tongues, and he hath given him power to give it; for how else shall *Xavier* convert the *Indians?* He hath given him also power to command the Seas and the winds, that they should obey him, for this also is very necessary in some cases. And so *pasce oves* is *accipe donum linguarum*, and *Impera ventis, & dispone regum diademata, & laicorum prædia*, and *influentias cæli* too, and whatsoever the parity of reason will judge equally necessary in order to *pasce oves*; when a man does speak reason, it is but reason he should be heard; but though he may have the good fortune, or the great abilities to doe it, yet he hath not a certainty, no regular infallible assistance, no inspiration of Arguments and deductions; and if he had, yet because it must be reason that must judge of reason, unless other mens understandings were of the same ayre, the same constitution and ability, they cannot be

prescrib'd unto, by another mans reason; especially because such reasonings as usually are in explication of particular places of Scripture, depend upon minute circumstances and particularities, in which it is so easy to be deceived, and so hard to speak reason regularly and alwayes, that it is the greater wonder if we be not deceived.

Numb. 4. 4. Others pretend to expound Scripture by the analogy of Faith, and that is the most sure and infallible way (as it is thought:) But upon stricter survey it is but a Chimera, a thing in *nubibus* which varies like the right hand and left hand of a Pillar, and at the best is but like the Coast of a Country to a Traveller out of his way; It may bring him to his journeyes end though twenty mile about; it may keep him from running into the Sea, and from mistaking a river for dry land; but whether this little path or the other be the right way it tells not. So is the analogy of Faith, that is, if I understand it right, the rule of Faith, that is the Creed. Now were it not a fine device to goe to expound all the Scripture by the Creed, there being in it so many thousand places which have no more relation to any Article in the Creed, then they have to *Tityre tu patula?* Indeed if a man resolves to keep the analogy of Faith, that is to expound Scripture, so as not to doe any violence to any fundamentall Article, he shall be sure however he erres, yet not to destroy Faith, he shall not perish in his Exposition. And that was the precept given by S. *Paul*, that all Propheſyings should be estimated κατ' ἀναλογίαν πίστεως, *Rom.* 6. 12. and to this very purpose, S. *Austin* in his Exposition of *Genesis*, by way of Preface sets down the Articles of Faith, with this design and protestation of it, that if he sayes nothing against those Articles, though he misse the particular sense of the place, there is no danger, or sinne in his Exposition; but how that analogy of Faith should have any other influence in expounding such places in which those Articles of Faith are neither expressed, nor involv'd, I understand not. But then if you extend the analogy of Faith further then that which is proper to the rule or Symbol of Faith, then every man expounds Scripture according to the analogy of Faith; but what? His own Faith: which Faith if it be questioned, I am no

more

more bound to expound according to the analogy of another mans Faith, then he to expound according to the analogy of mine. And this is it that is complain'd on of all ſides that overvalue their own opinions. Scripture ſeems ſo clearly to ſpeak what they believe, that they wonder all the world does not ſee it as clear as they doe; but they ſatisfie themſelves with ſaying that it is becauſe they come with prejudice, whereas if they had the true beliefe, that is, theirs, they would eaſily ſee what they ſee. And this is very true: For if they did believe as others believe, they would expound Scriptures to their ſenſe; but if this be expounding according to the analogy of Faith, it ſignifies no more then this, Be you of my mind and then my Arguments will ſeem concluding and my Authorities and Allegations preſſing and pertinent: And this will ſerve on all ſides, and therefore will doe but little ſervice to the determination of Queſtions, or preſcribing to other mens conſciences on any ſide.

Laſtly, Conſulting the Originals is thought a great matter to Interpretation of Scriptures. But this is to ſmall purpoſe: For indeed it will expound the Hebrew and the Greek, and rectifie Tranſlations. But I know no man that ſayes that the Scriptures in Hebrew and Greek are eaſie and certaine to be underſtood, and that they are hard in Latine and Engliſh: The difficulty is in the thing however it be expreſſed, the leaſt is in the language. If the Originall Languages were our mother tongue, Scripture is not much the eaſier to us; and a naturall Greek or a Jew, can with no more reaſon, nor authority obtrude his Interpretations upon other mens conſciences, then a man of another Nation. Adde to this that the inſpection of the Originall, is no more certain way of Interpretation of Scripture now then it was to the Fathers and Primitive Ages of the Church; and yet he that obſerves what infinite variety of Tranſlations of the Bible were in the firſt Ages of the Church (as S. *Hierom* obſerves) and never a one like another; will think that we ſhall differ as much in our Interpretations as they did, and that the medium is as uncertain to us as it was to them; and ſo it is; witneſſe the great number of late Tranſlations, and the infinite number of Commentaries, *Numb.* 5.

which

which are too pregnant an Argument that wee neither agree in the understanding of the words nor of the sense.

Numb. 6. The truth is, all these wayes of Interpreting of Scripture which of themselves are good helps, are made either by design, or by our infirmities, wayes of intricating and involving Scriptures in greater difficulty, because men doe not learn their doctrines from Scripture, but come to the understanding of Scripture with preconceptions and idea's of doctrines of their own, and then no wonder that Scriptures look like Pictures, wherein every man in the roome believes they look on him only, and that whereſoever he stands, or how often soever he changes his station. So that now what was intended for a remedy, becomes the promoter of our disease, and our meat becomes the matter of sicknesses: And the mischiefe is, the wit of man cannot find a remedy for it; for there is no rule, no limit, no certain principle, by which all men may be guided to a certain and so infallible an Interpretation, that he can with any equity prescribe to others to believe his Interpretations in places of controversy or ambiguity. A man would think that the memorable Propheſy of *Jacob*, that the Scepter should not depart from *Judah* till *Shiloh* come, should have been so clear a determination of the time of the *Messias*, that a Jew should never have doubted it to have been verified in Jesus of *Nazareth*; and yet for this so clear vaticination, they have no lesse then twenty six Answers. S. *Paul* and S. *James* seem to speak a little diverſly concerning Justification by Faith and Works, and yet to my understanding it is very easy to reconcile them: but all men are not of my mind; for *Osiander* in his confutation of the book which *Melanchton* wrote against him, observes, that there are twenty severall opinions concerning Iustification, all drawn from the Scriptures, by the men only of the *Augustan* Confession. There are sixteen severall opinions concerning originall sinne; and as many definitions of the Sacraments as there are Sects of men that disagree about them.

Numb. 7. And now what help is there for us in the midst of these uncertainties? If we follow any one Translation, or any one mans Commentary, what rule shall we have to chuse the right by?

by? or is there any one man, that hath tranſlated perfectly, or expounded infallibly? No Tranſlation challenges ſuch a prerogative as to be authentick, but the Vulgar Latine; and yet ſee with what good ſucceſſe: For when it was declared authentick by the Councell of *Trent*, *Sixtus* put forth a Copy much mended of what it was, and tyed all men to follow that; but that did not ſatisfie; for Pope *Clement* reviews and corrects it in many places, and ſtill the Decree remaines in a changed ſubject. And ſecondly, that Tranſlation will be very unapt to ſatisfie, in which one of their own men *Iſidore Clarius* a Monk of *Breſcia*, found and mended eight thouſand faults, beſides innumerable others which he ſayes he pretermitted. And then thirdly, to ſhew how little themſelves were ſatisfied with it, divers learned men amongſt them did new tranſlate the Bible, and thought they did God and the Church good ſervice in it. So that if you take this for your precedent, you are ſure to be miſtaken infinitely: If you take any other, the Authors themſelves doe not promiſe you any ſecurity. If you reſolve to follow any one as farre only as you ſee cauſe, then you only doe wrong or right by chance; for you have certainty juſt proportionable to your own skill, to your own infallibility. If you reſolve to follow any one, whether ſoever he leads, we ſhall oftentimes come thither, where we ſhall ſee our ſelves become ridiculous, as it happened in the caſe of *Spiridion* Biſhop of *Cyprus*, who ſo reſolv'd to follow his old book, that when an eloquent Biſhop who was deſired to Preach, read his Text, *Tu autem tolle cubile tuum & ambula*; *Spiridion* was very angry with him, becauſe in his book it was *tolle lectum tuum*, and thought it arrogance in the preacher to ſpeak better Latine then his Tranſlatour had done: And if it be thus in Tranſlations, it is farre worſe in Expoſitions: [*Quia ſcil. Scripturam ſacram pro ipſa ſui altitudine non uno eodemq; ſenſu omnes accipiunt, ut penè quot homines tot illic ſententiæ erui poſſe videantur*, ſaid *Vincent. Lirinenſis*] in which every man knows what innumerable wayes there are of being miſtaken, God having in things not ſimply neceſſary left ſuch a difficulty upon thoſe parts of Scripture which are the ſubject matters of controverſy *ad edomandam ſuperbiam, & intellectum à* In Commonit.

fastidio revocandum (as S. *Austin* gives a reason) that all that erre honestly, are therefore to be pityed, and tolerated, because it is or may be the condition of every man at one time or other.

Lib. 2. de doctr. Christian. c. 6.

Numb. 8. The summe is this: Since holy Scripture is the repository of divine truths, and the great rule of Faith, to which all Sects of Christians doe appeale for probation of their severall opinions, and since all agree in the Articles of the Creed as things clearly and plainly set down, and as containing all that which is of simple and prime necessity; and since on the other side there are in Scripture many other mysteries, and matters of Question upon which there is a vaile; since there are so many Copies with infinite varieties of reading; since a various Interpunction, a parenthesis, a letter, an accent may much alter the sense; since some places have divers literall senses, many have spirituall, mysticall and Allegoricall meanings; since there are so many tropes, metonymies, ironies, hyperboles, proprieties and improprieties of language, whose understanding depends upon such circumstances that it is almost impossible to know its proper Interpretation; [now that the knowledge of such circumstances and particular stories is irrevocably lost: since there are some mysteries which at the best advantage of expression, are not easy to be apprehended, and whose explication, by reason of our imperfections, must needs be dark, sometimes weak, sometimes unintelligle: and lastly, since those ordinary meanes of expounding Scripture, as searching the Originalls, conference of places, parity of reason, and analogy of Faith, are all dubious, uncertain, and very fallible, he that is the wisest and by consequence the likelyest to expound truest in all probability of reason, will be very farre from confidence, because every one of these and many more are like so many degrees of improbability and incertainty, all depressing our certainty of finding out truth in such mysteries and amidst so many difficulties. And therefore a wise man that considers this, would not willingly be prescrib'd to by others; and therefore if he also be a just man, he will not impose upon others; for it is best every man should be left in that liberty from which no man can justly take him, unless he could secure him from errour: So that here also there is a

necessity

neceſſity to conſerve the liberty of Propheſying, and Interpreting Scripture; a neceſſity deriv'd from the conſideration of the difficulty of Scripture in Queſtions controverted, and the uncertainty of any internall medium, of Interpretation.

SECT. V.

Of the inſufficiency and uncertainty of Tradition to Expound Scripture, or determine Queſtions.

IN the next place, we muſt conſider thoſe extrinſecall meanes of Interpreting Scripture, and determining Queſtions, which they moſt of all confide in that reſtraine Propheſying with the greateſt Tyranny. The firſt and principall is Tradition, which is pretended not only to expound Scripture (*Neceſſe enim eſt propter tantos tam varii erroris anfractus, ut Prophetica & Apoſtolica interpretationis linea ſecundum Eccleſiaſtici & Catholici ſenſus normam dirigatur:*) but alſo to propound Articles upon a diſtinct ſtock, ſuch Articles whereof there is no mention and propoſition in Scripture. And in this topick, not only the diſtinct Articles are clear and plain, like as the fundamentals of Faith expreſſed in Scripture, but alſo it pretends to expound Scripture, and to determine Queſtions with ſo much clarity and certainty, as there ſhall neither be errour nor doubt remaining, and therefore no diſagreeing is here to be endured. And indeed it is moſt true if Tradition can perſorme theſe pretenſions, and teach us plainly, and aſſure us infallibly of all truths, which they require us to believe, we can in this caſe have no reaſon to disbelieve them, and therefore are certainly Hereticks if we doe, becauſe without a crime, without ſome humane intereſt or collaterall deſign, we cannot disbelieve traditive Doctrine or traditive Interpretation, if it be infallibly prov'd to us that tradition is an infallible guide. *Numb.* 1. Vincent. Lirinenſ. in Commonitor.

But here I firſt conſider that tradition is no repoſitory of Articles of Faith, and therefore the not following it is no *Numb.* 2.

Argument of heresy; for besides that I have shewed Scripture in its plain expresses to be an abundant rule of Faith and manners, Tradition is a topick as fallible as any other; so fallible that it cannot be sufficient evidence to any man in a matter of Faith or Question of heresy.

Numb. 3. For 1. I find that the Fathers were infinitely deceived in their account and enumeration of Traditions, sometimes they did call some Traditions such, not which they knew to be so, but by Arguments and presumptions they concluded them so. Such as was that of S. *Austin, ea quæ universalis tenet Ecclesia nec à Conciliis instituta reperiuntur, credibile est ab Apostolorum traditione descendisse.* Now suppose this rule probable that's the most, yet it is not certaine; It might come by custome, whose Originall was not knowne, but yet could not derive from an Apostolicall principle. Now when they conclude of particular Traditions by a generall rule, and that generall rule not certain, but at the most probable in any thing, and certainly false in some things, it is wonder if the productions, that is, their judgements, and pretence faile so often. And if I should but instance in all the particulars, in which Tradition was pretended falsly or uncertainly in the first Ages, I should multiply them to a troublesome variety; for it was then accounted so glorious a thing to have spoken with the persons of the Apostles, that if any man could with any colour pretend to it, he might abuse the whole Church, and obtrude what he lifted under the specious title of Apostolicall Tradition, and it is very notorious to every man that will but read and observe the Recognitions or stromata of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, where there is enough of such false wares shewed in every book, and pretended to be no lesse then from the Apostles. In the first Age after the Apostles, *Papias* pretended he received a Tradition from the Apostles, that Christ before the day of Judgement should reign a thousand yeares upon Earth, and his Saints with him in temporall felicities; and this thing proceeding from so great an Authority as the testimony of *Papias*, drew after it all or most of the Christians in the first three hundred years. For besides, that the Millenary opinion is expresly taught by *Papias*, *Justin Martyr*, *Irenæus*, *Origen*, *Lactantius*, *Severus*, *Victorinus*, *Apollinaris*, *Nepos*,

Epist. 118. ad Ianuar. De bapt. contr. Donat. lib. 4. c. 24.

Nepos, and divers others famous in their time, *Juſtin Martyr* in his Dialogue againſt *Tryphon* ſayes, it was the beliefe of all Chriſtians exactly Orthodox, καὶ εἰ τίνες εἰσὶ χρ̄ι πάντα ὀρθογνώμονες χριστιανοὶ, and yet there was no ſuch Tradition, but a miſtake in *Papias*; but I find it nowhere ſpoke againſt, till *Dionyſius* of *Alexandria* confuted *Nepo*'s Book, and converted *Coracion* the *Egyptian* from the opinion. Now if a Tradition whoſe beginning of being called ſo began with a Scholar of the Apoſtles (for ſo was *Papias*) and then continued for ſome Ages upon the meer Authority of ſo famous a man, did yet deceive the Church: much more fallible is the pretence, when two or three hundred years after, it but commences, and then by ſome learned man is firſt called a Tradition Apoſtolicall. And ſo it hapned in the caſe of the *Arrian* hereſy, which the *Nicene* Fathers did confute by objecting a contrary Tradition Apoſtolicall, as *Theodoret* reports; and yet if they had not had better Arguments from Scripture then from Tradition, they would have faild much in ſo good a cauſe; for this very pretence the *Arrians* themſelves made, and deſired to be tryed by the Fathers of the firſt three hundred years, which was a confutation ſufficient to them who pretended a clear Tradition, becauſe it was unimaginable that the Tradition ſhould leap ſo as not to come from the firſt to the laſt by the middle. But that this tryall was ſometime declined by that excellent man S. *Athanaſius*, although at other times confidently and truly pretended, it was an Argument the Tradition was not ſo * clear, but both ſides might with ſome fairneſſe pretend to it. And therefore one of the prime Founders of their hereſy, the Heretick † *Artemon* having obſerved the advantage might be taken by any Sect that would pretend Tradition, becauſe the medium was plauſible and conſiſting of ſo many particulars, that it was hard to be redargued, pretended a Tradition from the Apoſtles, that Chriſt was ψιλὸς ἄνθρωπος, and that the Tradition did deſcend by a conſtant ſucceſſion in the Church of *Rome* to Pope *Victors* time incluſively, and till *Zepherinus* had interrupted the ſeries and corrupted the Doctrine; which pretence if it had not had ſome appearance of truth, ſo as poſſibly to abuſe the Church, had not been worthy of confutation, which yet was with care undertaken

Lib. 1. hiſt. c. 8.

Vide Petav. in Epiph. her. 69.

* καὶ γὰρ εἰσὶ τίνες ὦ φίλος ἔλεγον ἀπὸ τῶ ἡμετέρω γένες ὁμολογούμενες αὐτὸν Χριστὸν εἶε, ἀνθρωπον ψιλὸν ἐξ ἀνθρώπων γενόμενον ἀναφαινόμενοι, ὃς ἐ σωτῆθε. μεν, εἰ δε αν πολλοὶ τοιαῦτα μὴ δογμάτιζε σιν ἐσται, ut in Mate. dini ad Tryph. Iu. ſtinian. Martyr. Quæſt. 30. ad Gentiles.

dertaken by an old Writer, out of whom *Euſebius* tranſcribes a large paſſage to reprove the vanity of the pretender. But I obſerve from hence, that it was uſuall to pretend to Tradition, and that it was eaſier pretended then confuted, and I doubt not but oftner done then diſcovered. A great Queſtion aroſe in *Africa* concerning the Baptiſm of Hereticks, whether it were valid or no. S. *Cyprian* and his party appealed to Scripture; *Stephen* Biſhop of *Rome* and his party, would be judged by cuſtome and Tradition Eccleſiaſticall. See how much the neaſer the Queſtion was to a determination, either that probation was not accounted by S. *Cyprian*, and the Biſhops both of *Aſia* and *Africk*, to be a good Argument, and ſufficient to determine them, or there was no certain Tradition againſt them; for unleſſe one of theſe two doe it, nothing could excuſe them from oppoſing a known truth, unleſſe peradventure, S. *Cyprian*, *Firmilian*, the Biſhops of *Galatia*, *Cappadocia*, and almoſt two parts of the World were ignorant of ſuch a Tradition, for they knew of none ſuch, and ſome of them expreſly denyed it. And the ſixth generall Synod approves of the Canon made in the Councell of *Carthage* under *Cyprian* upon this very ground, becauſe in *prædictorum præſulum locis & ſolum ſecundum traditam eis conſuetudinem ſervatus eſt*; they had a particular Tradition for Rebaptization, and therefore there could be no Tradition Univerſall againſt it, or if there were they knew not of it, but much for the contrary; and then it would be remembred that a conceal'd Tradition was like a ſilent Thunder, or a Law not promulgated; it neither was known, nor was obligatory. And I ſhall obſerve this too, that this very Tradition was ſo obſcure, and was ſo obſcurely delivered, ſilently proclaimed, that S. *Auſtin* who diſputed againſt the *Donatiſts* upon this very Queſtion was not able to prove it but by a conſequence which he thought probale and credible, as appears in his diſcourſe againſt the *Donatiſts*. *The Apoſtles*, ſaith S. *Auſtin*, *preſcrib'd nothing in this particular: But this cuſtome which is contrary to Cyprian ought to be believed to have come from their Tradition, as many other things which the Catholike Church obſerves.* That's all the ground and all the reaſon; nay the Church did waver concerning that Queſtion, and before the

Can. 2.

L. 5. de baptiſm. contr. Donat. c. 23.

deciſion

deciſion of a Councell, *Cyprian* and others might diſſent without breach of charity. It was plain then there was no clear Tradition in the Queſtion, poſſibly there might be a cuſtome in ſome Churches *poſtnate* to the times of the Apoſtles, but nothing that was obligatory, no Tradition Apoſtolicall. But this was a ſuppletory device ready at hand when ever they needed it; and S. *Auſtin* confuted the *Pelagians*, in the Queſtion of Originall ſinne, by the cuſtome of exorciſme and inſufflation, which S. *Auſtin* ſaid came from the Apoſtles by Tradition, which yet was then, and is now ſo impoſſible to be prov'd, that he that ſhall affirm it, ſhall gaine only the reputation of a bold man and a confident.

Lib. 1. de baptiſm. c. 18.

De peccat. originali. l. 2. c. 40. contra Pelagi. & Cæleſt.

2. I conſider if the report of Traditions in the Primitive times ſo neare the Ages Apoſtolicall was ſo uncertain, that they were fain to aym at them by conjectures, and grope as in the dark, the uncertainty is much encreaſed ſince, becauſe there are many famous Writers whoſe works are loſt, which yet if they had continued, they might have been good records to us, as *Clemens Romanus*, *Egeſippus*, *Nepos*, *Coracion*, *Dionyſius Areopagita*, of *Alexandria*, of *Corinth*, *Firmilian* and many more: And ſince we ſee pretences have been made without reaſon in thoſe Ages where they might better have been confuted, then now they can, it is greater prudence to ſuſpect any later pretences, ſince ſo many Sects have been, ſo many warres, ſo many corruptions in Authors, ſo many Authors loſt, ſo much ignorance hath intervened, and ſo many intereſts have been ſerved, that now the rule is to be altered; and whereas it was of old time credible, that that was Apoſtolicall whoſe beginning they knew not, now quite contrary we cannot ſafely believe them to be Apoſtolicall unleſſe we doe know their beginning to have been from the Apoſtles. For this conſiſting of probabilities and particulars, which put together make up a morall demonſtration, the Argument which I now urge hath been growing theſe fifteen hundred years; and if anciently there was ſo much as to evacuate the Authority of Tradition, much more is there now abſolutely to deſtroy it, when all the particulars, which time and infinite variety of humane accidents have been amaſſing together, are now concentred, and are united by

Numb. 4.

way

way of constipation. Because every Age and every great change, and every heresy, and every interest, hath increased the difficulty of finding out true Traditions.

Numb. 5. 3. There are very many Traditions which are lost, and yet they are concerning matters of as great consequence as most of those Questions for the determination whereof Traditions are pretended: It is more then probable, that as in Baptism and the Eucharist the very formes of ministration are transmitted to us, so also in confirmation and ordination, and that there were speciall directions for visitation of the sick, and explicite interpretations of those difficult places of S. *Paul* which S. *Peter* affirmed to be so difficult that the ignorant doe wrest them to their own damnation, and yet no Church hath conserved these or those many more which S. *Basil* affirms to be so many that ὀπλείψη ἡμέρα τὰ ἄγραφα τῆς ἐκκλησίας μυστήρια διηγούμενος; the day would faile him in the very simple enumeration of all Traditions Ecclesiasticall. And if the Church hath fail'd in keeping the great variety of Traditions, it will hardly be thought a fault in a private person to neglect Tradition, which either the whole Church hath very much neglected inculpably, or else the whose Church is very much too blame. And who can ascertain us that she hath not entertained some which are no Traditions as well as lost thousands that are? That she did entertain some false Traditions, I have already prov'd; but it is also as probable that some of those which these Ages did propound for Traditions, are not so, as it is certain that some which the first Ages cald Traditions, were nothing lesse.

Cap. 29. de Spir. Sancto.

Numb. 6. 4. There are some opinions which when they began to be publikely received, began to be accounted prime Traditions, and so became such not by a native title, but by adoption; and nothing is more usuall then for the Fathers to colour their popular opinion with so great an appellative. S. *Austin* cald the communicating of Infants an Apostolicall Tradition, and yet we doe not practise it, because we disbelieve the Allegation. And that every custome which at first introduction was but a private fancy or singular practise, grew afterwards into a publike rite and went for a Tradition after a while continuance, appears by *Tertullian* who seems to justifie it, *Non enim existimo tu*

Contra Marcion.

lic ture

licitum esse cuicunq; fideli constituere quod Deo placere illi visum fuerit, ad disciplinam & salutem. And againe, *A quocunq; traditore cenſetur, nec authorem respicias sed authoritatem.* And S. *Hierome* most plainly, *Præcepta majorum Apostolicas Traditiones quisq; existimat.* And when *Irenæus* had observed that great variety in the keeping of Lent, which yet to be a fourty dayes Fast is pretended to descend from Tradition Apostolicall, some fasting but one day before Easter, some two, some fourty, and this even long before *Irenæus* time, he gives this reason, *Varietas illa jejunii cœpit apud Majores nostros qui non accuratè consuetudinem eorum qui vel simplicitate quâdam vel privatâ authoritate in posterum aliquid statu ſsent, observarant* [*ex translatione Christophorsoni:*] And there are yet some points of good concernment, which if any man should Question in a high manner, they would prove indeterminable by Scripture, or sufficient reason, and yet I doubt not their confident Defenders would say they are opinions of the Church, and quickly pretend a Tradition from the very Apostles, and believe themselves so secure that they could not be discovered, because the Question never having been disputed, gives them occasion to say that which had no beginning known, was certainly from the Apostles. For why should not Divines doe in the Question of reconfirmation as in that of rebaptization? Are not the grounds equall from an indelible character in one as in the other? and if it happen such a Question as this after contestation should be determin'd not by any positive decree, but by the cession of one part, and the authority and reputation of the other, does not the next Age stand faire to be abused with a pretence of Tradition, in the matter of reconfirmation, which never yet came to a serious Question? For so it was in the Question of rebaptization for which there was then no more evident Tradition then there is now in the Question of reconfirmation, as I proved formerly, but yet it was carried upon that Title.

De coron. milit. c. 3. & 4.

Apud Euseb. l. 5. c. 24.

5. There is great variety in the probation of Tradition, so that whatever is proved to be Tradition, is not equally and alike credible; for nothing but universall Tradition is of it selfe credible; other Traditions in their just proportion as they partake of the degrees of universality. Now that a Tradition be

Numb. 7.

universall, or which is all one that it be a credible Testimony, S. *Irenæus* requires that Tradition should derive from all the Churches Apostolicall. And therefore according to this rule there was no sufficient medium to determine the Question about Easter, because the Eastern and Western Churches had severall Traditions respectively, and both pretended from the Apostles. *Clemens Alexandrinus* sayes, it was a secret Tradition from the Apostles that Christ preached but one year; But *Irenæus* sayes it did derive from Hereticks, and sayes that he by Tradition first from S. *John*, and then from his Disciples received another Tradition, that Christ was almost fifty years old when he dyed, and so by consequence preached almost twenty years; both of them were deceived, and so had all that had believed the report of either pretending Tradition Apostolicall. Thus the custome in the Latine Church of fasting on Saturday was against that Tradition which the Greeks had from the Apostles; and therefore by this division and want of consent, which was the true Tradition was so absolutely indeterminable, that both must needs lose much of their reputation. But how then when not only particular Churches but single persons are all the proofe we have for a Tradition? And this often hapned; I think S. *Austin* is the chiefe Argument and Authority we have for the Assumption of the Virgin *Mary*; the Baptism of Infants is called a Tradition by *Origen* alone at first, and from him by others. The procession of the holy Ghost from the Sonne, which is an Article the Greek Church disavowes, derives from the Tradition Apostolicall, as it is pretended; and yet before S. *Austin* we heare nothing of it very cleerly or certainly, for as much as that whole mystery concerning the blessed Spirit was so little explicated in Scripture, and so little derived to them by Tradition, that till the Councell of *Nice*, you shall hardly find any form of worship or personall addresse of devotion to the holy Spirit, as *Erasmus* observes, and I think the contrary will very hardly be verified. And for this particular in which I instance, whatsoever is in Scripture concerning it, is against that which the Church of *Rome* calls Tradition, which makes the Greeks so confident as they are of the point, and is an Argument of the vanity of some things which for no greater

Lib. 3. c. 1.

Li. 1. Stromat.

L. 2. c. 39. Omnes Seniores testantur qui in Asiâ apud Iohannem Discipulum Domini convenerunt id ipsum tradidisse eis Iohannem, &c. & qui alios Apostolos viderunt hæc eadem ab ipsis audierunt, & testantur de ejusmodi relatione.

Salmeron. disput. 51. in Rom.

greater reason are called Traditions, but because one man hath said so, and that they can be proved by no better Argument to be true. Now in this case wherein Tradition descends upon us with unequall certainty, it would be very unequall to require of us an absolute belieſe of every thing not written, for feare we be accounted to slight Tradition Apostolicall. And since no thing can require our supreme assent, but that which is truly Catholike and Apostolike, and to such a Tradition is requir'd as *Irenæus* sayes, the consent of all those Churches which the Apostles planted, and where they did preside, this topick will be of so little use in judging heresies that (besides what is deposited in Scripture) it cannot be proved in any thing but in the Canon of Scripture it selfe, and as it is now received, even in that there is some variety.

And therefore there is wholy a mistake in this businesse; for when the Fathers appeal to Tradition, and with much earnestnesse, and some clamour they call upon Hereticks to conform to or to be tryed by Tradition, it is such a Tradition as delivers the fundamentall points of Christianity, which were also recorded in Scripture. But because the Canon was not yet perfectly consign'd, they call'd to that testimony they had, which was the testimony of the Churches Apostolicall, whose Bishops and Priests being the *Antistites religionis*, did believe and preach Christian Religion and conserve all its great mysteries according as they had been taught. *Irenæus* calls this a Tradition Apostolicall, *Christum accepisse calicem, & dixisse sanguinem suum esse, & docuisse novam oblationem novi Testamenti, quam Ecclesia per Apostolos accipiens offert per totum mundum.* And the Fathers in these Ages confute Hereticks by Ecclesiasticall Tradition, that is, they confront against their impious and blaspemous doctrines that Religion which the Apostles having taught to the Churches where they did preside, their Successors did still preach, and for a long while together suffered not the enemy to sow tares amongst their wheat. And yet these doctrines which they called Traditions, were nothing but such fundamentall truths which were in Scripture, πάντα σύμφωνα ταῖς γραφαῖς, as *Irenæus* in *Eusebius* observes, in the instance of *Polycarpus*, and it is manifest by considering

Numb. 8.

Lib. 5. cap. 20.

what heresies they fought against, the heresies of *Ebion*, *Cerinthus*, *Nicolaitans*, *Valentinians*, *Carpocratians*, persons that denyed the Sonne of God, the Unity of the God-head, that preached impurity, that practised Sorcery and Witch-craft. And now that they did rather urge Tradition against them then Scripture, was, because the publike Doctrine of all the Apostolicall Churches was at first more known and famous then many parts of the Scripture, and because some Hereticks denyed S. *Lukes* Gospel, some received none but S. *Matthews*, some rejected all S. *Pauls* Epistles, and it was a long time before the whole Canon was consign'd by universall Testimony, some Churches having one part some another, *Rome* her selfe had not all, so that in this case the Argument from Tradition was the most famous, the most certain, and the most prudent. And now according to this rule they had more Traditions then we have, and Traditions did by degrees lessen as they came to be written, and their necessity was lesse, as the knowledge of them was ascertained to us by a better Keeper of Divine Truths. All that great mysteriousnesse of Christs Priest-hood, the unity of his Sacrifice, Christs Advocation and Intercession for us in Heaven, and many other excellent Doctrines might very well be accounted Traditions before S. *Pauls* Epistle to the *Hebrews* was publish'd to all the World; but now they are written truths; and if they had not, possibly we might either have lost them quite, or doubted of them as we doe of many other Traditions, by reason of the insufficiency of the propounder. And therefore it was that S. *Peter* took order that the Gospel should be Writ, for he had promised that he would doe something which after his decease should have these things in remembrance. He knew it was not safe trusting the report of men where the fountain might quickly run dry, or be corrupted so insensibly, that no cure could be found for it, nor any just notice taken of it till it were incurable. And indeed there is scarce any thing but what is written in Scripture, that can with any confidence of Argument pretend to derive from the Apostles, except ritualls, and manners of ministration; but no doctrines or speculative mysteries are so transmitted to us by so cleer a current, that we may see a visible channell,

Vid. Irenæ. l. 3 & 4. cont. hæres.

2 Pet. 1. 13.

and

and trace it to the Primitive fountaines. It is ſaid to be a Tradition Apoſtolicall, that no Prieſt ſhould baptize without chriſm and the command of the Biſhop: Suppoſe it were, yet we cannot be oblig'd to believe it with much confidence, becauſe we have but little proofe for it, ſcarce any thing but the ſingle teſtimony of S. *Hierom.* And yet if it were, this is but a rituall, of which in paſſing by, I ſhall give that account: That, ſuppoſe this and many more ritualls did derive clearly from Tradition Apoſtolicall (which yet but very few doe) yet it is hard that any Church ſhould be charged with crime for not obſerving ſuch ritualls, becauſe we ſee ſome of them which certainly did derive from the Apoſtles, are expir'd and gone out in a deſuetude; ſuch as are abſtinence from blood, and from things ſtrangled, the cœnobitick life of ſecular perſons, the colledge of widowes, to worſhip ſtanding upon the Lords day, to give milk and honey to the newly baptized, and many more of the like nature; now there having been no mark to diſtinguiſh the neceſſity of one from the indifferency of the other, they are all alike neceſſary, or alike indifferent; if the former, why does no Church obſerve them? if the later, why does the Church of *Rome* charge upon others the ſhame of novelty, for leaving of ſome Rites and Ceremonies which by her own practice we are taught to have no obligation in them, but to be adiaphorous? S. *Paul* gave order, that a Biſhop ſhould be the husband of one wife; The Church of *Rome* will not allow ſo much; other Churches allow more: The Apoſtles commanded Chriſtians to Faſt on Wedneſday and Friday, as appeares in their Canons; The Church of *Rome* Faſts Friday and Saturday, and not on Wedneſday: The Apoſtles had their Agapæ or love Feaſts, we ſhould believe them ſcandalous: They uſed a kiſſe of charity in ordinary addreſſes, the Church of *Rome* keeps it only in their Maſſe, other Churches quite omit it: The Apoſtles permitted Prieſts and Deacons to live in conjugall Society as appears in the 5. Can. of the Apoſtles (which to them is an Argument who believe them ſuch) and yet the Church of *Rome*, by no meanes will endure it; nay more, *Michael Medina* gives Teſtimony that of 84 Canons Apoſtolicall which *Clemens* collected, ſcarce ſix or eight are obſerved by the Latine Church, and

Dialog. adv. Lucifer.

De fact. hom. constanter, l. 5. c. 105.

and *Pereſius* gives this account of it, *In illis contineri multa quæ temporum corruptione non plenè obſervantur, aliis pro tempor's & materiæ qualitate aut obliteratis, aut totius Eccleſiæ magiſterio abrogatis.* Now it were good that they which take a liberty to themſelves, ſhould alſo allow the ſame to others. So that for one thing or other, all Traditions excepting thoſe very few that are abſolutely univerſall, will loſe all their obligation, and become no competent medium to confine mens practiſes, or limit their faiths, or determine their perſwaſions. Either for the difficulty of their being prov'd, the incompetency of the teſtimony that tranſmits them, or the indifferency of the thing tranſmitted, all Traditions both rituall and doctrinall are diſabled from determining our conſciences either to a neceſſary believing or obeying.

De Tradit. part. 3. c. de Author. Can. Apoſt.

Numb. 9. 6. To which I adde by way of confirmation, that there are ſome things called Traditions, and are offered to be proved to us by a Teſtimony, which is either falſe or not extant. *Clemens* of *Alexandria* pretended it a Tradition that the Apoſtles preached to them that dyed in infidelity, even after their death, and then raiſed them to life, but he proved it only by the Teſtimony of the Book of *Hermes*; he affirmed it to be a Tradition Apoſtolicall, that the Greeks were ſaved by their Philoſophy, but he had no other Authority for it but the Apocryphall Books of *Peter* and *Paul*. *Tertullian* and S. *Baſil* pretend it an Apoſtolicall Tradition, to ſign in the aire with the ſign of the Croſſe, but this was only conſign'd to them in the Goſpel of *Nicodemus*. But to inſtance once for all in the Epiſtle of *Marcellus* to the Biſhop of *Antioch*, where he affirmes that it is the Canon of the Apoſtles, *præter ſententiam Romani Pontificis, non poſſe Concilia celebrari.* And yet there is no ſuch Canon extant, nor ever was for ought appears in any Record we have, and yet the Collection of the Canons is ſo intire, that though it hath ſomething more then what was Apoſtolicall, yet it hath nothing leſſe. And now that I am caſually fallen upon an inſtance from the Canons of the Apoſtles, I conſider that there cannot in the world a greater inſtance be given how eaſy it is to be abuſed in the believing of Traditions. For 1. to the firſt 50. which many did admit for Apoſtolicall; 35 more

more were added, which moſt men now count ſpurious, all men call dubious, and ſome of them univerſally condemned by peremptory ſentence, even by them who are greateſt admirers of that Collection, as 65. 67. and 85 Canons. For the firſt 50, it is evident that there are ſome things ſo mixt with them, and no mark of difference left, that the credit of all is much impared, inſomuch that *Iſidor* of *Sevill* ſayes, *they were Apocryphall, made by Hereticks, and publiſhed under the title Apoſtolicall, but neither the Fathers nor the Church of* Rome *did give aſſent to them.* And yet they have ptevail'd ſo farre amongſt ſome, that *Damaſcen* is of opinion they ſhould be received equally with the Canonicall writings of the Apoſtles. One thing only I obſerve (and we ſhall find it true in moſt writings, whoſe Authority is urged in Queſtions of *Theology*) that the Authority of the Tradition is not it which moves the aſſent, but the nature of the thing; and becauſe ſuch a Canon is delivered, they doe not therefore believe the ſanction or propoſition ſo delivered, but diſbelieve the Tradition, if they doe not like the matter, and ſo doe not judge of the matter by the Tradition, but of the Tradition by the matter. And thus the Church of *Rome* rejects the 84 or 85 Canon of the Apoſtles, not becauſe it is delivered with leſſe Authority, then the laſt 35 are, but becauſe it reckons the Canon of Scripture otherwiſe then it is at *Rome*. Thus alſo the fifth Canon amongſt the firſt 50, becauſe it approves the marriage of Prieſts and Deacons does not perſwade them to approve of it too, but it ſelfe becomes ſuſpected for approving it: So that either they accuſe themſelves of palpable contempt of the Apoſtolicall Authority, or elſe that the reputation of ſuch Traditions is kept up to ſerve their own ends, and therefore when they encounter them, they are more to be upheld; which what elſe is it but to teach all the world to contemn ſuch pretences and undervalue Traditions, and to ſupply to others a reaſon why they ſhould doe that, which to them that give the occaſion is moſt unreaſonable?

Apud Gratian. diſt. 16. c. Canones.

Lib. 4. c. 18 de Orthod. fide.

7. The Teſtimony of the Ancient Church being the only meanes of proving Tradition, and ſometimes their dictates and doctrine being the Tradition pretended of neceſſity to be imitated, *Numb.* 10.

imitated, it is considerable that men in their estimate of it, take their rise from severall Ages and differing Testimonies, and are not agreed about the competency of their Testimony; and the reasons that on each side make them differ, are such as make the Authority it selfe the lesse authentick and more repudiable. Some will allow only of the three first Ages, as being most pure, most persecuted, and therefore most holy, least interested, serving fewer designs, having fewest factions, and therefore more likely to speak the truth for Gods sake and its own, as best complying with their great end of acquiring Heaven in recompence of losing their lives: Others * say, that those Ages being persecuted minded the present Doctrines proportionable to their purposes and constitution of the Ages, and make little or nothing of those Questions which at this day vex Christendome: And both speak true; The first Ages speak greatest truth, but least pertinently. The next Ages, the Ages of the foure generall Councels spake something, not much more pertinently to the present Questions, but were not so likely to speak true, by reason of their dispositions contrary to the capacity and circumstance of the first Ages; and if they speak wisely as Doctors, yet not certainly as witnesses of such propositions which the first Ages noted not; and yet unlesse they had noted, could not possibly be Traditions. And therefore either of them will be lesse useleſse as to our present affaires. For indeed the Questions which now are the publike trouble, were not considered or thought upon for many hundred years, and therefore prime Tradition there is none as to our purpose, and it will be an insufficient medium to be used or pretended in the determination; and to dispute concerning the truth or necessity of Traditions, in the Questions of our times, is as if Historians disputing about a Question in the English Story, should fall on wrangling whether *Livie* or *Plutarch* were the best Writers: And the earnest disputes about Traditions are to no better purpose. For no Church at this day admits the one halfe of those things, which certainly by the Fathers were called Traditions Apostolicall, and no Testimony of ancient Writers does consign the one halfe of the present Questions, to be or not to be Traditions. So that they who admit only the Doctrine and Testimony of

* Vid. Card. Perron lettre au Sieur Casaubon.

of the firſt Ages cannot be determined in moſt of their doubts which now trouble us, becauſe their Writings are of matters wholy differing from the preſent diſputes, and they which would bring in after Ages to the Authority of a competent judge or witneſſe, ſay the ſame thing: for they plainly confeſſe that the firſt Ages ſpake little or nothing to the preſent Queſtion, or at leaſt nothing to their ſenſe of them; for therefore they call in aid from the following Ages, and make them ſuppletory and auxiliary to their deſigns, and therefore there are no Traditions to our purpoſes. And they who would willingly have it otherwiſe, yet have taken no courſe it ſhould be otherwiſe; for they when they had opportunity in the Councels of the laſt Ages to determine what they had a mind to, yet they never nam'd the number, nor expreſſed the particular Traditions which they would faine have the world believe to be Apoſtolicall: But they have kept the bridle in their own hands, and made a reſerve of their own power, that if need be, they may make new pretenſions, or not be put to it to juſtifie the old by the engagement of a conciliary declaration.

Laſtly, We are acquitted by the Teſtimony of the Primitive Fathers, from any other neceſſity of believing, then of ſuch Articles as are recorded in Scripture: And this is done by them, whoſe Authority is pretended the greateſt Argument for Tradition, as appears largely in *Irenæus*, who diſputes profeſſedly for the ſufficiency of Scripture againſt certain Heretieks, who affirm ſome neceſſary truths not to be written. It was an excellent ſaying of S. *Baſil* and will never be wipt out with all the eloquence of *Perron* [in his Serm. *de fide. Manifeſtus eſt fidei lapſus, & liquidum ſuperbiæ vitium vel reſpuere aliquid eorum quæ Scriptura habet, vel inducere quicquam quod ſcriptum non eſt.*] And it is but a poore device to ſay that every particular Tradition is conſigned in Scripture by thoſe places which give Authority to Tradition; and ſo the introducing of Tradition is not a ſuper-inducing any thing over or beſides Scripture, becauſe Tradition is like a Meſſenger, and the Scripture is like his Letters of Credence, and therefore Authorizes whatſoever Tradition ſpeaketh. For ſuppoſing Scripture does conſign the Authority of Tradition (which it might doe before all the whole

Numb. 11.

L. 3. c. 2. contr. hæreſ.

Inſtrument of Scripture it ſelf was conſign'd, and then afterwards there might be no need of Tradition) yet ſuppoſing it, it will follow that all thoſe Traditions which are truly prime and Apoſtolicall, are to be entertain'd according to the intention of the Deliverers, which indeed is ſo reaſonable of it ſelfe, that we need not Scripture to perſwade us to it; it ſelfe is authentick as Scripture is, if it derives from the ſame fountain; and a word is never the more the Word of God for being written, nor the leſſe for not being written; but it will not follow that whatſoever is pretended to be Tradition, is ſo, neither is the credit of the particular inſtances conſign'd in Scripture; *& doloſus verſatur in generalibus*, but that this craft is too palpable. And if a generall and indefinite conſignation of Tradition be ſufficient to warrant every particular that pretends to be Tradition, then S. *Baſil* had ſpoken to no purpoſe by ſaying it is Pride & Apoſtaſy from the Faith, to bring in what is not written: For if either any man brings in what is written, or what he ſayes is delivered, then the firſt being expreſſe Scripture, and the ſecond being conſign'd in Scripture, no man can be charged with ſuperinducing what is not written, he hath his Anſwer ready; And then theſe are zealous words abſolutely to no purpoſe; but if ſuch generall conſignation does not warrant every thing that pretends to Tradition, but only ſuch as are truly proved to be Apoſtolicall; then Scripture is uſeleſſe as to this particular; for ſuch Tradition gives teſtimony to Scripture, and therefore is of it ſelfe firſt, and more credible, for it is credible of it ſelfe; and therefore unleſſe S. *Baſil* thought that all the will of God in matters of Faith and Doctrine were written, I ſee not what end nor what ſenſe he could have in theſe words: For no man in the world except *Enthuſiaſts* and mad-men ever obtruded a Doctrine upon the Church, but he pretended Scripture for it or Tradition, and therefore no man could be preſſed by theſe words, no man confuted, no man inſtructed, no not *Enthuſiaſts* or *Montaniſts*. For ſuppoſe either of them ſhould ſay, that ſince in Scripture the holy Ghoſt is promiſed to abide with the Church for ever, to teach, whatever they pretend the Spirit in any Age hath taught them, is not to ſuper-induce any thing beyond what is written, becauſe the truth of the Spirit, his veracity, and his perpetuall

petuall teaching being promiſed and atteſted in Scripture, Scripture hath juſt ſo conſign'd all ſuch Revelations as *Perron* ſaith it hath all ſuch Traditions. But I will trouble my ſelfe no more with Arguments from any humane Authorities; but he that is ſurprized with the beliefe of ſuch Authorities, and will but conſider the very many Teſtimonies of Antiquity to this purpoſe, as of [a] *Conſtantine*, [b] S. *Hierom*, [c] S. *Auſtin*, [d] S. *Athanaſius*, [e] S. *Hilary*, [f] S. *Epiphanius*, and divers others, all ſpeaking words to the ſame ſenſe, with that ſaying of S. [g] *Paul*, *Nemo ſentiat ſuper quod ſcriptum eſt*, will ſee that there is reaſon, that ſince no man is materially a Heretick, but he that erres in a point of Faith, and all Faith is ſufficienly recorded in Scripture, the judgement of Faith and Hereſy is to be derived from thence, and no man is to be condemned for diſſenting in an Article for whoſe probation Tradition only is pretended; only according to the degree of its evidence, let every one determine himſelfe, but of this evidence we muſt not judge for others; for unleſſe it be in things of Faith, and abſolute certainties, evidence is a word of relation, and ſo ſuppoſes two terms, the object and the faculty; and it is an imperfect ſpeech to ſay a thing is evident in it ſelfe (unleſſe we ſpeak of firſt principles or cleareſt revelations) for that may be evident to one that is not ſo to another, by reaſon of the pregnancy of ſome apprehenſions, and the immaturity of others.

This Diſcourſe hath its intention in Traditions Doctrinall and Rituall, that is ſuch Traditions which propoſe Articles new *in materiâ*; but now if Scripture be the repoſitory of all Divine Truths ſufficient for us, Tradition muſt be conſidered as its inſtrument, to convey its great myſteriouſneſſe to our underſtandings; it is ſaid there are traditive Interpretations as well as traditive propoſitions, but theſe have not much diſtinct conſideration in them, both becauſe their uncertainty is as great as the other upon the former conſiderations; as alſo becauſe in very deed, there are no ſuch things as traditive Interpretations univerſall: For as for particulars, they ſignifie no more but that they are not ſufficient determinations of Queſtions Theologicall, therefore becauſe they are particular, contingent, and of infinite variety, and they are no more Argu-

[a] Orat. ad Nicen. PP. apud. Theodor. l. 1. c. 7.
[b] In Matth. l. 4. c. 23. & in Aggæum.
[c] De bono viduil. c. 1.
[d] Orat. contr. gent.
[e] In Pſal. 132.
[f] L. 2. contra. hereſ. tom. 1. hær. 61.
[g] 1. Cor. 4.

ment then the particular authority of theſe men whoſe Commentaries they are, and therefore muſt be conſidered with them.

Numb. 12. The ſumme is this: Since the Fathers who are the beſt Witneſſes of Traditions, yet were infinitely deceived in their account, ſince ſometimes they gueſt at them and conjectured by way of Rule and Diſcourſe, and not of their knowledge, not by evidence of the thing; ſince many are called Traditions which were not ſo, many are uncertaine whether they were or no, yet confidently pretended; and this uncertainty which at firſt was great enough, is increaſed by infinite cauſes and accidents in the ſucceſſion of 1600 yeares; ſince the Church hath been either ſo careleſſe or ſo abuſed that ſhee could not, or would not preſerve Traditions with carefulneſſe and truth; ſince it was ordinary for the old Writers to ſet out their own fancies, and the Rites of their Church which had been Ancient under the ſpecious Title of Apoſtolicall Traditions; ſince ſome Traditions rely but upon ſingle Teſtimony at firſt, and yet deſcending upon others, come to be atteſted by many, whoſe Teſtimony though conjunct, yet in value is but ſingle, becauſe it relies upon the firſt ſingle Relator, and ſo can have no greater authority, or certainty, then they derive from the ſingle perſon; ſince the firſt Ages who were moſt competent to conſign Tradition, yet did conſign ſuch Traditions as be of a nature wholy diſcrepant from the preſent Queſtions, and ſpeak nothing at all or very imperfectly to our purpoſes; and the following Ages are no fit Witneſſes of that which was not tranſmitted to them, becauſe they could not know it at all, but by ſuch tranſmiſſion and prior conſignation; ſince what at firſt was a Tradition, came afterwards to be written, and ſo ceaſed its being a Tradition; yet the credit of Traditions commenced upon the certainty and reputation of thoſe truths firſt delivered by word, afterward conſign'd by writing; ſince what was certainly Tradition Apoſtolicall, as many Rituals were, are rejected by the Church in ſeverall Ages, and are gone out into a deſuetude; and laſtly, ſince, beſide the no neceſſity of Traditions, there being abundantly enough in Scripture, there are many things called Traditions by the Fathers, which they

them-

themſelves either proved by no Authors, or by Apocryphall and ſpurious and Hereticall, the matter of Tradition will in very much be ſo uncertain, ſo falſe, ſo ſuſpitious, ſo contradictory, ſo improbable, ſo unproved, that if a Queſtion be conteſted and be offered to be proved only by Tradition, it will be very hard to impoſe ſuch a propoſition to the beliefe of all men with any imperiouſneſſe or reſolved determination, but it will be neceſſary men ſhould preſerve the liberty of believing and propheſying, and not part with it, upon a worſe merchandiſe and exchange then *Eſau* made for his birthright.

SECT. VI.

Of the uncertainty and inſufficiency of Councels Eccleſiaſticall to the ſame purpoſe.

Numb. 1. BUt ſince we are all this while in uncertainty, it is neceſſary that we ſhould addreſſe our ſelves ſomewhere, where we may reſt the ſoale of our foot: And nature, Scripture, and experience teach the world in matters of Queſtion to ſubmit to ſome finall ſentence. For it is not reaſon that controverſies ſhould continue till the erring perſon ſhall be willing to condemn himſelfe; and the Spirit of God hath directed us by that great precedent at *Jeruſalem*, to addreſſe our ſelves to the Church, that in a plenary Councell and Aſſembly, ſhee may ſynodically determine Controverſies. So that if a Generall Councell have determin'd a Queſtion, or expounded Scripture, we may no more disbelieve the Decree, then the Spirit of God himſelfe who ſpeaks in them. And indeed, if all Aſſemblies of Biſhops were like that firſt, and all Biſhops were of the ſame ſpirit of which the Apoſtles were, I ſhould obey their Decree with the ſame Religion as I doe them whoſe preface was *Viſum eſt Spiritui Sancto & nobis:* And I doubt not but our bleſſed Saviour intended that the Aſſemblies of the Church ſhould be Judges of Controverſies, and guides of our perſwa-

Inſtrument of Scripture it ſelf was conſign'd, and then afterwards there might be no need of Tradition) yet ſuppoſing it, it will follow that all thoſe Traditions which are truly prime and Apoſtolicall, are to be entertain'd according to the intention of the Deliverers, which indeed is ſo reaſonable of it ſelfe, that we need not Scripture to perſwade us to it; it ſelfe is authentick as Scripture is, if it derives from the ſame fountain; and a word is never the more the Word of God for being written, nor the leſſe for not being written; but it will not follow that whatſoever is pretended to be Tradition, is ſo, neither is the credit of the particular inſtances conſign'd in Scripture; *& doloſus verſatur in generalibus*, but that this craft is too palpable. And if a generall and indefinite conſignation of Tradition be ſufficient to warrant every particular that pretends to be Tradition, then S. *Baſil* had ſpoken to no purpoſe by ſaying it is Pride & Apoſtaſy from the Faith, to bring in what is not written: For if either any man brings in what is written, or what he ſayes is delivered, then the firſt being expreſſe Scripture, and the ſecond being conſign'd in Scripture, no man can be charged with ſuperinducing what is not written, he hath his Anſwer ready; And then theſe are zealous words abſolutely to no purpoſe; but if ſuch generall conſignation does not warrant every thing that pretends to Tradition, but only ſuch as are truly proved to be Apoſtolicall; then Scripture is uſeleſſe as to this particular; for ſuch Tradition gives teſtimony to Scripture, and therefore is of it ſelfe firſt, and more credible, for it is credible of it ſelfe; and therefore unleſſe S. *Baſil* thought that all the will of God in matters of Faith and Doctrine were written, I ſee not what end nor what ſenſe he could have in theſe words: For no man in the world (except *Enthuſiaſts* and mad-men ever obtruded a Doctrine upon the Church, but he pretended Scripture for it or Tradition, and therefore no man could be preſſed by theſe words, no man confuted, no man inſtructed, no not *Enthuſiaſts* or *Montaniſts*. For ſuppoſe either of them ſhould ſay, that ſince in Scripture the holy Ghoſt is promiſed to abide with the Church for ever, to teach, whatever they pretend the Spirit in any Age hath taught them, is not to ſuper-induce any thing beyond what is written, becauſe the truth of the Spirit, his veracity, and his perpetuall

petuall teaching being promiſed and atteſted in Scripture, Scripture hath juſt ſo conſign'd all ſuch Revelations as *Perron* ſaith it hath all ſuch Traditions. But I will trouble my ſelfe no more with Arguments from any humane Authorities; but he that is ſurprized with the beliefe of ſuch Authorities, and will but conſider the very many Teſtimonies of Antiquity to this purpoſe, as of [a] *Conſtantine*, [b] S. *Hierom*, [c] S. *Auſtin*, [d] S. *Athanaſius*, [e] S. *Hilary*, [f] S. *Epiphanius*, and divers others, all ſpeaking words to the ſame ſenſe, with that ſaying of S. [g] *Paul*, *Nemo ſentiat ſuper quod ſcriptum eſt*, will ſee that there is reaſon, that ſince no man is materially a Heretick, but he that erres in a point of Faith, and all Faith is ſufficienly recorded in Scripture, the judgement of Faith and Hereſy is to be derived from thence, and no man is to be condemned for diſſenting in an Article for whoſe probation Tradition only is pretended; only according to the degree of its evidence, let every one determine himſelfe, but of this evidence we muſt not judge for others; for unleſſe it be in things of Faith, and abſolute certainties, evidence is a word of relation, and ſo ſuppoſes two terms, the object and the faculty; and it is an imperfect ſpeech to ſay a thing is evident in it ſelfe (unleſſe we ſpeak of firſt principles or cleareſt revelations) for that may be evident to one that is not ſo to another, by reaſon of the pregnancy of ſome apprehenſions, and the immaturity of others.

This Diſcourſe hath its intention in Traditions Doctrinall and Rituall, that is ſuch Traditions which propoſe Articles new *in materiâ*; but now if Scripture be the repoſitory of all Divine Truths ſufficient for us, Tradition muſt be conſidered as its inſtrument, to convey its great myſteriouſneſſe to our underſtandings; it is ſaid there are traditive Interpretations as well as traditive propoſitions, but theſe have not much diſtinct conſideration in them, both becauſe their uncertainty is as great as the other upon the former conſiderations; as alſo becauſe in very deed, there are no ſuch things as traditive Interpretations univerſall: For as for particulars, they ſignifie no more but that they are not ſufficient determinations of Queſtions Theologicall, therefore becauſe they are particular, contingent, and of infinite variety, and they are no more Argu-

[a] Orat. ad Nicen. PP. apud. Theodor. l. 1. c. 7.
[b] In Matth. l. 4. c. 23. & in Aggæum.
[c] De bono viduil. c. 1.
[d] Orat. contr. gent.
[e] In Pſal. 132.
[f] L. 2. contra. hereſ. tom. 1. hær. 61.
[g] 1. Cor. 4.

ment then the particular authority of these men whose Commentaries they are, and therefore must be considered with them.

Numb. 12. The summe is this: Since the Fathers who are the best Witnesses of Traditions, yet were infinitely deceived in their account, since sometimes they guest at them and conjectured by way of Rule and Discourse, and not of their knowledge, not by evidence of the thing; since many are called Traditions which were not so, many are uncertaine whether they were or no, yet confidently pretended; and this uncertainty which at first was great enough, is increased by infinite causes and accidents in the succession of 1600 yeares; since the Church hath been either so careless or so abused that shee could not, or would not preserve Traditions with carefulnesse and truth; since it was ordinary for the old Writers to set out their own fancies, and the Rites of their Church which had been Ancient under the specious Title of Apostolicall Traditions; since some Traditions rely but upon single Testimony at first, and yet descending upon others, come to be attested by many, whose Testimony though conjunct, yet in value is but single, because it relies upon the first single Relator, and so can have no greater authority, or certainty, then they derive from the single person; since the first Ages who were most competent to consign Tradition, yet did consign such Traditions as be of a nature wholy discrepant from the present Questions, and speak nothing at all or very imperfectly to our purposes; and the following Ages are no fit Witnesses of that which was not transmitted to them, because they could not know it at all, but by such transmission and prior consignation; since what at first was a Tradition, came afterwards to be written, and so ceased its being a Tradition; yet the credit of Traditions commenced upon the certainty and reputation of those truths first delivered by word, afterward consign'd by writing; since what was certainly Tradition Apostolicall, as many Rituals were, are rejected by the Church in severall Ages, and are gone out into a desuetude; and lastly, since, beside the no necessity of Traditions, there being abundantly enough in Scripture, there are many things called Traditions by the Fathers, which they

them-

themſelves either proved by no Authors, or by Apocryphall and ſpurious and Hereticall, the matter of Tradition will in very much be ſo uncertain, ſo falſe, ſo ſuſpitious, ſo contradictory, ſo improbable, ſo unproved, that if a Queſtion be conteſted and be offered to be proved only by Tradition, it will be very hard to impoſe ſuch a propoſition to the beliefe of all men with any imperiouſneſſe or reſolved determination, but it will be neceſſary men ſhould preſerve the liberty of believing and propheſying, and not part with it, upon a worſe merchandiſe and exchange then *Eſau* made for his birthright.

SECT. VI.

Of the uncertainty and inſufficiency of Councels Eccleſiaſticall to the ſame purpoſe.

BUt ſince we are all this while in uncertainty, it is neceſſary that we ſhould addreſſe our ſelves ſomewhere, where we may reſt the ſoale of our foot: And nature, Scripture, and experience teach the world in matters of Queſtion to ſubmit to ſome finall ſentence. For it is not reaſon that controverſies ſhould continue till the erring perſon ſhall be willing to condemn himſelfe; and the Spirit of God hath directed us by that great precedent at *Jeruſalem*, to addreſſe our ſelves to the Church, that in a plenary Councell and Aſſembly, ſhee may ſynodically determine Controverſies. So that if a Generall Councell have determin'd a Queſtion, or expounded Scripture, we may no more disbelieve the Decree, then the Spirit of God himſelfe who ſpeaks in them. And indeed, if all Aſſemblies of Biſhops were like that firſt, and all Biſhops were of the ſame ſpirit of which the Apoſtles were, I ſhould obey their Decree with the ſame Religion as I doe them whoſe preface was *Viſum eſt Spiritui Sancto & nobis:* And I doubt not but our bleſſed Saviour intended that the Aſſemblies of the Church ſhould be Judges of Controverſies, and guides of our perſwa- *Numb.* 1.

sions in matrers of difficulty. But he also intended they should proceed according to his will which he had revealed, and those precedents which he had made authentick by the immediate assistance of his holy Spirit: He hath done his part, but we doe not doe ours. And if any private person in the simplicity and purity of his soule desires to find out a truth of which he is in search and inquisition, if he prayes for wisedome, we have a promise he shall be heard and answered liberally, and therefore much more, when the representatives of the Catholike Church doe meet, because every person there hath *in individuo* a title to the promise, and another title as he is a governour and a guide of soules, and all of them together have another title in their united capacity, especially, if in that union they pray, and proceed with simplicity and purity; so that there is no disputing against the pretence and promises, and authority of Generall Councels. For if any one man can hope to be guided by Gods Spirit in the search, the pious and impartiall and unprejudicate search of truth, then much more may a Generall Councell. If no private man can hope for it, then truth is not necessary to be found, nor we are not oblig'd to search for it, or else we are sav'd by chance: But if private men can by vertue of a promise, upon certain conditions be assured of finding out sufficient truth, much more shall a Generall Councell. So that I consider thus: There are many promises pretended to belong to Generall Assemblies in the Church; But I know not any ground, nor any pretence, that they shall be absolutely assisted, without any condition on their own parts, and whether they will or no: Faith is a vertue as well as charity, and therefore consists in liberty and choyce, and hath nothing in it of necessity: There is no Question but that they are obliged to proceed according to some rule; for they expect no assistance by way of *Enthusiasme*; if they should, I know no warrant for that, neither did any Generall Councell ever offer a Decree which they did not think sufficiently prov'd by Scripture, Reason, or Tradition, as appears in the Acts of the Councels; now then, if they be tyed to conditions, it is their duty to observe them; but whether it be certaine that they will observe them, that they will doe all their duty, that they will not sin

even

even in this particular in the neglect of their duty, that's the consideration. So that if any man questions the Title and Authority of Generall Councels, and whether or no great promises appertain to them, I suppose him to be much mistaken; but he also that thinks all of them have proceeded according to rule and reason, and that none of them were deceived, because possibly they might have been truly directed, is a stranger to the History of the Church, and to the perpetuall instances and experiments of the faults and failings of humanity. It is a famous saying of S. *Gregory* that he had the foure first Councels in esteem and veneration next to the foure Evangelists; I suppose it was because he did believe them to have proceeded according to Rule, and to have judged righteous judgement; but why had not he the same opinion of other Councels too which were celebrated before his death, for he lived after the fifth Generall? not because they had not the same Authority; for that which is warrant for one is warrant for all; but because he was not so confident that they did their duty nor proceeded so without interest as the first foure had done, and the following Councels did never get that reputation which all the Catholike Church acknowledged due to the first foure. And in the next Order were the three following generalls; for the Greeks and Latines did never joyntly acknowledge but seven generalls to have been authentick in any sense, because they were in no sense agreed that any more then seven had proceeded regularly and done their duty: So that now the Question is not whether Generall Councels have a promise that the holy Ghost will assist them; For every private man hath that promise, that if he does his duty he shall be assisted sufficiently in order to that end to which he needs assistance; and therefore much more shall Generall Councels in order to that end for which they convene, and to which they need assistance, that is, in order to the conservation of the Faith, for the doctrinall rules of good life, and all that concerns the essentiall duty of a Christian, but not in deciding Questions to satisfie contentious or curious or presumptuous spirits. But now can the Bishops so conven'd be factious, can they be abused with prejudice, or transported with interests, can they resist the holy

Ghost,

Ghost, can they extinguish the Spirit, can they stop their eares, and serve themselves upon the holy Spirit and the pretence of his assistances, and cease to serve him upon themselves, by captivating their understandings to his dictates, and their wills to his precepts? Is it necessary they should perform any condition? is there any one duty for them to perform in these Assemblies, a duty which they have power to doe or not doe? If so, then they may faile of it, and not doe their duty: And if the assistance of the holy Spirit be conditionall, then we have no more assurance that they are assisted, then that they doe their duty and doe not sinne.

Numb. 2. Now let us suppose what this duty is: Certainly, if the Gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost; and all that come to the knowledge of the truth, must come to it by such meanes which are spirituall and holy dispositions, in order to a holy and spirituall end. They must be shod with the preparation of the Gospel of peace, that is, they must have peaceable and docible dispositions, nothing with them that is violent, and resolute to encounter those gentle and sweet assistances: and the Rule they are to follow, is the Rule which the holy Spirit hath consign'd to the Catholike Church, that is the holy Scripture, either * intirely or at least for the greater part of the Rule: So that now if the Bishops bee factious and prepossest with perswasions depending upon interest, it is certain they may judge amisse; and if they recede from the Rule, it is certain they doe judge amisse: And this I say upon their grounds who most advance the authority of Generall Councels: For if a Generall Councell may erre if a Pope confirm it not, then most certainly if in any thing it recede from Scripture, it does also erre; because that they are to expect the Popes confirmation they offer to prove from Scripture: now if the Popes confirmation be required by authority of Scripture, and that therefore the defaillance of it does evacuate the Authority of the Councell, then also are the Councels Decrees invalid, if they recede from any other part of Scripture: So that Scripture is the Rule they are to follow, and a man would have thought it had been needlesse to have proved it, but that we are fallen into Ages in which no truth is certaine, no reason concluding

* Vid. Optat. Milev. l. 3. adv. Parm. Baldvin. in eundem. & S. August. in Psal. 21. Expos. 2.

concluding, nor is there any thing that can convince ſome men. For *Stapleton* with extreme boldneſſe againſt the piety of Chriſtendome, againſt the publike ſenſe of the ancient Church, and the practiſe of all pious Aſſemblies of Biſhops affirmes the Decrees of a Councell to be binding, *etiamſi non confirmetur ne probabili teſtimonio Scripturarum*; nay, though it be quite *extra Scripturam*, but all wiſe and good men have ever ſaid that ſenſe which S. *Hilary* expreſſed in theſe words, *Quæ extra Evangelium ſunt non defendam*; This was it which the good Emperour *Conſtantine* propounded to the Fathers met at *Nice, libri Evangelici, oracula Apoſtolorum, & veterum Prophetarum clarè nos inſtruunt quid ſentiendum in Divinis*, and this is confeſſed by a ſober man of the Roman Church it ſelfe, the Cardinall of *Cuſa*, *Oportet quod omnia talia quæ legere debent, contineantur in Authoritatibus ſacrarum Scripturarum*: Now then all the advantage I ſhall take from hence, is this, That if the Apoſtles commended them who examined their Sermons by their conformity to the Law and the Prophets, and the men of *Berea* were accounted noble for ſearching the Scriptures whether thoſe things which they taught were ſo or no; I ſuppoſe it will not be denyed, but the Councels Decrees, may alſo be tryed whether they be conform to Scripture yea or no; and although no man can take cogniſance and judge the Decrees of a Councell *pro Authoritate publicâ*, yet *pro informatione privatâ* they may; the Authority of a Councell is not greater then the Authority of the Apoſtles, nor their dictates more ſacred or authentick. Now then put caſe a Councell ſhould recede from Scripture; whether or no were we bound to believe its Decrees? I only aske the Queſtion: For it were hard to be bound to believe what to our underſtanding ſeems contrary to that which we know to be the Word of God: But if we may lawfully recede from the Councels Decrees, in caſe they be contrariant to Scripture, it is all that I require in this Queſtion. For if they be tyed to a Rule, then they are to be examined and underſtood according to the Rule, and then we are to give our ſelves that liberty of judgement which is requiſite to diſtinguiſh us from beaſts, and to put us into a capacity of reaſonable people, following reaſonable guides. But

Relect. controv. 4. q. 1. a. 3

l. 2. ad Conſtant.

Apud Theodor. l. 1. c. 7.

Concord. Cathol. l. 3. c. 10.

how ever if it be certaine that the Councells are to follow Scripture, then if it be notorious that they doe recede from Scripture, we are sure we must obey God rather then men, and then we are well enough. For unlesse we are bound to shut our eyes, and not to look upon the Sunne, if we may give our selves liberty to believe what seemes most plaine, and unlesse the Authority of a Councell be so great a prejudice as to make us to doe violence to our understanding, so as not to disbelieve the Decree, because it seemes contrary to Scripture, but to believe it agrees with Scripture, though we know not how, therefore because the Councell hath decreed it, unlesse I say we be bound in duty to be so obediently blind, and sottish, we are sure that there are some Councels which are pretended Generall, that have retired from the publike notorious words and sence of Scripture. For what wit of man can reconcile the Decree of the thirteenth Session of the Councell of *Constance* with Scripture, in which Session the halfe Communion was decreed, in defiance of Scripture, and with a *non obstante* to Christs institution. For in the Preface of the Decree, Christs institution and the practise of the Primitive Church is expressed, and then with a *non obstante*, Communion in one kind is establisht. Now then suppose the *non obstante* in the form of words relates to the Primitive practise; yet since Christs institution was taken notice of in the first words of the Decree, and the Decree made quite contrary to it, let the *non obstante* relate whither it will, the Decree (not to call it a defiance) is a plaine recession from the institution of Christ, and therefore the *non obstante* will referre to that without any sensible error; and indeed for all the excuses to the contrary, the Decree was not so discreetly fram'd but that in the very form of words, the defiance and the *non obstante* is too plainly relative to the first words. For what sense can there be in the first *licet* else? *licet Christus in utraq; specie*, and *licet Ecclesia Primitiva, &c. tamen hoc non obstante, &c.* the first *licet* being a relative terme, as well as the second *licet*, must be bounded with some correspondent. But it matters not much; let them whom it concernes enjoy the benefit of all excuses they can imagine, it is certaine Christs institution and the Conncels sanction

are

are as contrary as light and darkneſſe. Is it poſſible for any man to contrive a way to make the Decree of the Councell of *Trent*, commanding the publike Offices of the Church to be in Latine, friends with the fourteenth chapter of the *Corinthians*? It is not amiſſe to obſerve how the Hyperaſpiſts of that Councell ſweat to anſwer the Allegations of S. *Paul*, and the wiſeſt of them doe it ſo extremly poore, that it proclaimes to all the world that the ſtrongeſt man, that is, cannot eat Iron or ſwallow a Rock. Now then, would it not be an unſpeakable Tyranny to all wiſe-perſons, (who as much hate to have their ſoules enſlaved as their bodies impriſoned) to command them to believe that theſe Decrees are agreeable to the word of God? Upon whoſe underſtanding ſoever theſe are impoſed, they may at the next Seſſion reconcile them to a crime, and make any ſinne ſacred, or perſwade him to believe propoſitions contradictory to a Mathematicall demonſtration. All the Arguments in the world that can be brought to prove the infallibility of Councels, can not make it ſo certain that they are infallible, as theſe two inſtances doe prove infallibly that theſe were deceived, and if ever we may ſafely make uſe of our reaſon and conſider whether Councels have erred or no, we cannot by any reaſon be more aſſured, that they have or have not, then we have in theſe particulars: ſo that either our reaſon is of no manner of uſe, in the diſcuſſion of this Queſtion, and the thing it ſelfe is not at all to be diſputed, or if it be, we are certain that theſe actually were deceived, and we muſt never hope for a clearer evidence in any diſpute. And if theſe be, others might have been, if they did as theſe did, that is, depart from their Rule. And it was wiſely ſaid of *Cuſanus*: *Notandum eſt experimento rerum univerſale Concilium poſſe deficere*: The experience of it is notorious, that Councels have erred: And all the Arguments againſt experience are but plain ſophiſtry. L. 2. c. 14. Concord. Cathol.

And therefore I make no ſcruple to ſlight the Decrees of ſuch Councels, wherein the proceedings were as prejudicate and unreaſonable, as in the Councell wherein *Abailardus* was condemned, where the preſidents having pronounced *Damnamus*, they at the lower end being awaked at the noiſe, heard the latter part of it, and concurred as farre as *Mnamus* went, and *Numb.* 3.

that was as good as *Damnamus*, for if they had been awake at the pronouncing the whole word, they would have given ſentence accordingly. But by this meanes S. *Bernard* numbred the major part of voices againſt his Adverſary *Abailardus*: And as farre as theſe men did doe their duty, the duty of Priests and Judges, and wiſe men; ſo we may preſume them to be aſſiſted: But no further. But I am content this (becauſe but a private Aſſembly) ſhall paſſe for no inſtance: But what ſhall we ſay of all the Arrian Councels celebrated with ſo great fancy, and ſuch numerous Aſſemblies? we all ſay that they erred. And it will not be ſufficient to ſay they were not lawfull Councels: For they were conven'd by that Authority which all the world knowes did at that time convocate Councels, and by which (as it is * confeſſed and is notorious) the firſt eight Generalls did meet, that is by the Authority of the Emperour all were called, and as many and more did come to them, then came to the moſt famous Councell of *Nice*: So that the Councels were lawfull, and if they did not proceed lawfully, and therefore did erre, this is to ſay that Councels are then not deceiv'd, when they doe their duty, when they judge impartially, when they decline intereſt, when they follow their Rule; but this ſayes alſo that it is not infallibly certain that they will doe ſo; for theſe did not, and therefore the others may be deceiv'd as well as theſe were. But another thing is in the wind; for Councels not confirmed by the Pope, have no warrant that they ſhall not erre, and they not being confirmed, therefore faild. But whether is the Popes confirmation after the Decree or before? It cannot be ſuppoſed before; for there is nothing to be confirmed till the Decree be made, and the Article compoſed. But if it be after, then poſſibly the Popes Decree may be requiſite in ſolemnity of Law, and to make the Authority popular, publike and humane; but the Decree is true or falſe before the Popes confirmation, and is not at all altered by the ſupervening Decree, which being *poſtnate* to the Decree, alters not what went before, *Nunquam enim creſcit ex poſtfacto præteriti æſtimatio*, is the voyce both of Law and reaſon. So that it cannot make it divine, and neceſſary to be heartily believed. It may make it lawfull, not make it true, that is, it may poſſibly by

Epiſt. Abailardi ad Heliſſ. conjugem.

* Cuſanus, l. 2. cap. 25, Concord.

by such meanes become a Law but not a truth. I speak now upon supposition the Popes confirmation were necessary, and requir'd to the making of conciliary and necessary sanctions. But if it were, the case were very hard: For suppose a heresy should invade, and possesse the Chaire of *Rome*, what remedy can the Church have in that case, if a Generall Councell be of no Authority without the Pope confirm it? will the Pope confirm a Councell against himselfe; will he condemn his own heresy? That the Pope may be a Heretick appears in the * Canon Law, which sayes he may for heresy be deposed, and therefore by a Councell which in this case hath plenary Authority without the Pope. And therefore in the Synod at *Rome* held under Pope *Adrian* the Second, the Censure of the Sixth Synod against *Honorius* who was convict of heresy, is approved with this Appendix, that in this case the case of heresy, *minores possint de majoribus judicare*: And therefore if a Pope were above a Councell, yet when the Question is concerning heresy, the case is altered; the Pope may be judg'd by his inferiours, who in this case which is the maine case of all, become his Superiours. And it is little better then impudence to pretend that all Councells were confirmed by the Pope, or that there is a necessity in respect of divine obligation, that any should be confirmed by him, more then by another of the Patriarchs. For the Councell of *Chalcedon* it selfe one of those foure which S. *Gregory* did revere next to the foure Evangelists, is rejected by Pope *Leo*, who in his 53 Epistle to *Anatolius*, and in his 54 to *Martian*, and in his 55 to *Pulcheria*, accuses it of ambition and inconsiderate temerity, and therefore no fit Assembly for the habitation of the holy Spirit, and *Gelasius* in his Tome *de vinculo Anathematis*, affirms that the Councell is in part to be receiv'd, in part to be rejected, and compares it to hereticall books of a mixt matter, and proves his assertion by the place of S. *Paul*, *Omnia probate, quod bonum est retinete*. And *Bellarmine* sayes the same; *In Concilio Chalcedonensi quædam sunt bona, quædam mala, quædam recipienda, quædam rejicienda; ita & in libris hæreticorum*, and if any thing be false, then all is Questionable, and judicable and discernable, and not infallible antecedently. And however, that Councell hath *ex postfacto*, and by the voluntary

* Dist. 40. Can. si Papa.

De Iudic. l. 3. c. 20. § ad hoc ult.

voluntary consenting of after Ages obtained great reputation; yet they that lived immediately after it, that observed all the circumstances of the thing, and the disabilities of the persons, and the uncertainty of the truth of its decrees, by reason of the unconcludingnesse of the Arguments brought to attest it, were of another mind, *Quod autem ad Concilium Chalcedonense attinet, illud id temporis (viz. Anastasii Imp.) neq; palam in Ecclesiis sanctissimis prædicatum fuit, neq; ab omnibus rejectum, nam singuli Ecclesiarum præsides pro suo arbitratu in ea re egerunt.* And so did all men in the world that were not master'd with prejudices and undone in their understanding with accidentall impertinencies; they judg'd upon those grounds which they had and saw, and suffered not themselves to be bound to the imperious dictates of other men, who are as uncertain in their determinations as other in their Questions. And it is an evidence that there is some deception, and notable errour either in the thing or in the manner of their proceeding, when the Decrees of a Councell shall have no authority from the Compilers, nor no strength from the reasonablenesse of the decision, but from the accidentall approbation of Posterity: And if Posterity had pleased, *Origen* had believed well and been an Orthodox person. And it was pretty sport to see that *Papias* was right for two Ages together, and wrong ever since; and just so it was in Councels, particularly in this of *Chalcedon*, that had a fate alterable according to the Age, and according to the Climate, which to my understanding is nothing else but an Argument that the businesse of infallibility is a later device, and commenc'd to serve such ends as cannot be justified by true and substantiall grounds, and that the Pope should confirm it as of necessity, is a fit cover for the same dish.

Evagr. lib. 3. cap. 30.

Numb. 4. In the sixth Generall Councell, *Honorius* Pope of *Rome* was condemned; did that Councell stay for the Popes Confirmation before they sent forth their Decree? Certainly they did not think it so needfull, as that they would have suspended or cassated the Decree, in case the Pope had then disavowed it: For besides the condemnation of Pope *Honorius* for heresy, the 13th and 55th Canons of that Councell are expressely against the custome of the Church of *Rome*. But this particular is involved

volved in that new Queſtion, whether the Pope be above a Councell. Now ſince the Conteſtation of this Queſtion, there was never any free or lawfull Councell that determined for the Pope, it is not likely any ſhould, and is it likely that any Pope will confirm a Councell that does not? For the Councell of *Baſil* is therefore condemn'd by the laſt Lateran which was an Aſſembly in the Popes own Palace, and the Councell of *Conſtance* is of no value in this Queſtion, and ſlighted in a juſt proportion, as that Article is disbelieved. But I will not much trouble the Queſtion with a long conſideration of this particular; the pretence is ſenſeleſſe and illiterate, againſt reaſon and experience, and already determin'd by S. *Auſtin* ſufficiently as to this particular, *Ecce putemus illos Epiſcopos qui Romæ judicaverunt non bonos judices fuiſſe, Reſtabat adhuc plenarium Eccleſiæ univerſæ Concilium ubi etiam cum ipſis judicibus cauſa poſſit agitari, ut ſi male judicaſſe convicti eſſent, eorum ſententiæ ſolverentur.* For ſince Popes may be parties, may be Simoniacks, Schiſmaticks, Hereticks, it is againſt reaſon that in their own cauſes, they ſhould be judges, or that in any cauſes they ſhould be ſuperior to their judges. And as it is againſt reaſon, ſo is it againſt all experience too; for the Councell *Sinveſſanum* (as it ſaid) was conven'd to take Cogniſance of Pope *Marcellinus*; and divers Councels were held at *Rome* to give judgement in the cauſes of *Damaſus*, *Sixtus* the III, *Symmachus*, and *Leo* III and IV, as is to be ſeen in *Platina*, and the *Tomes* of the Councels. And it is no anſwer to this and the like allegations to ſay in matters of fact and humane conſtitution, the Pope may be judg'd by a Councell, but in matters of Faith all the world muſt ſtand to the Popes determination and authoritative deciſion: For if the Pope can by any colour pretend to any thing, it is to a ſuprem Judicature in matters Eccleſiaſticall, poſitive and of fact; and if he failes in this pretence, he will hardly hold up his head for any thing elſe; for the ancient Biſhops deriv'd their Faith from the fountaine, and held that in the higheſt tenure, even from Chriſt their Head; but by reaſon of the Imperiall * City it became the principall Seat, and he ſurpriz'd the higeſt Judicature, partly by the conceſſion of others, partly by his own accidentall advantages, and yet even in theſe things although

* Vid. poſtea de Concil. Sanveſſano. §.6. N.9.

Epiſt. 162. ad Glorium.

* Vide Concil. Chalced act. 15.

Act. ult. can. 21.

although he was *major ſingulis*, yet he was *minor univerſis*: And this is no more then what was decreed of the eighth Generall Synod; which if it be ſenſe, is pertinent to this Queſtion; for Generall Councels are appointed to take Cognizance of Queſtions and differences about the Biſhop of *Rome*, *non tamen audacter in eum ferre ſententiam*: By *audacter*, as is ſuppoſed, is meant *præcipitanter* haſtily and unreaſonably; but if to give ſentence againſt him bee wholy forbidden, it is non-ſenſe for to what purpoſe is an Authority of taking Cognizance, if they have no power of giving ſentence, unleſſe it were to deferre it to a ſuperiour Judge, which in this caſe cannot be ſuppoſed? for either the Pope himſelfe is to judge his own cauſe after their examination of him, or the Generall Councell is to judge him: So that although the Councell is by that Decree enjoyn'd to proceed modeſtly and warily, yet they may proceed to ſentence, or elſe the Decree is ridiculous and impertinent.

Numb. 5. But to cleare all, I will inſtance in matters of Queſtion and opinion: For not only ſome Councels have made their Decrees without or againſt the Pope, but ſome Councels have had the Popes confirmation, and yet have not been the more legitimate or obligatory, but are known to be hereticall. For the Canons of the ſixth Synod although ſome of them were made againſt the Popes, and the cuſtome of the Church of *Rome*, a Pope a while after did confirm the Councell, and yet the Canons are impious and hereticall, and ſo eſteem'd by the Church of *Rome* her ſelfe. I inſtance in the ſecond Canon which approves of that Synod of *Carthage* under *Cyprian* for rebaptization of Hereticks, and the 72 Canon that diſſolves marriage between perſons of differing perſwaſion in matters of Chriſtian Religion; and yet theſe Canons were approved by Pope *Adrian* I. who in his Epiſtle to *Tharaſius*, which is in the ſecond action of the ſeventh Synod, calls them *Canones divinè & legaliter prædicatos*. And theſe Canons were uſed by Pope *Nicholas* I. in his Epiſtle *ad Michaelem*, and by *Innocent* III. *c. à multis. extra. de ætat. ordinandorum.* So that now (that wee may apply this) there are ſeven Generall Councels which by the Church of *Rome* are condemn'd

of

of errour. The * Councell of *Antioch*, *A.D.* 345. in which S. *Athanasius* was condemn'd: The Councell of *Millaine* *A.D.* 354. of above 300 Bishops: The Councell of *Arimi-num*, consisting of 600 Bishops: The second Councell of *Ephe-sus*, *A.D.* 449. in which the *Eutychian* heresy was confirmed, and the Patriarch *Flavianus* kild by the faction of *Dioscorus*: The Councell of *Constantinople* under *Leo Isaurus*, *A.D.*730: And another at *Constantinople* 35 years after: And lastly, the Councel at *Pisa* 134 years since. Now that these Generall Councels are condemn'd, is a sufficient Argument that Councels may erre; and it is no answer to say they were not confirm'd by the Pope; for the Popes confirmation I have shewn not to be necessary, or if it were, yet even that also is an Argument that Generall Councels may become invalid, either by their own fault, or by some extrinsecall supervening accident, either of which evacuates their Authority; and whether all that is required to the legitimation of a Councell, was actually observ'd in any Councell, is so hard to determine, that no man can be infallibly sure that such a Councell is authentick and sufficient probation.

*Vid. Socra. l. 2. c. 5. & Sozom. l. 3. c. 5.

Gregor. in Regist. l. 3. cauſ. 7. ait. Concilium Numidiæ erraſſe. Concilium Aquiſgrani erravit. De raptore & raptâ diſt. 20. can. de libellis. in gloſſâ.

2. And that is the second thing I shall observe, There are so many Questions concerning the efficient, the forme, the matter of Generall Councells, and their manner of proceeding, and their finall sanction, that after a Question is determin'd by a Conciliary Assembly, there are perhaps twenty more Questions to be disputed before we can with confidence either believe the Councell upon its meere Authority, or obtrude it upon others. And upon this ground, how eaſy it is to elude the pressure of an Argument drawn from the Authority of a Generall Councell, is very remarkable in the Question about the Popes or the Councels Superiority, which Question although it be defin'd for the Councell against the Pope by five Generall Councels, the Councell of *Florence*, of *Constance*, of *Basil*, of *Pisa*, and one of the *Lateran's*, yet the Jesuites to this day, account this Question *pro non definitâ*, and have rare pretences for their escape; as first, It is true, a Councell is above a Pope, in case there be no Pope, or he uncertain; which is *Bellarmine's* answer, never considering whether he spake sense or no,

Numb. 6.

1.

nor yet remembring that the Councell of *Basil* deposed *Eugenius*
2. who was a true Pope and so acknowledg'd. Secondly, sometimes the Pope did not confirm these Councels, that's their Answer: (And although it was an exception that the Fathers never thought of, when they were pressed with the Authority of the Councell of *Ariminum* or *Syrmium*, or any other *Arrian* Convention;) yet the Councell of *Basil* was conven'd by Pope *Martin* V. then, in its sixteenth Session, declar'd by *Eugenius* the IV. to be lawfully continued and confirmed expresly in some of its Decrees by Pope *Nicholas*, and so stood till it was at last rejected by *Leo* X. very many years after; but that came too late, and with too visible an interest; and this Councell did decree *fide Catholicâ tenendum Concilium esse supra Papam*: But if one Pope confirms it, and another rejects it, as it happened in this case and in many more, does it not destroy the competency of the Authority? and we see it by this instance, that it so serves the turns of men, that it is good in some cases, that is, when it makes for them, and invalid when it makes against
3. them. Thirdly, but it is a little more ridiculous in the case of the Councell of *Constance*, whose Decrees were confirm'd by *Martin* V. But that this may be no Argument against them, *Bellarmine* tells you he only confirm'd those things *quæ facta fuerant Conciliariter, re diligenter examinatâ*, of which there being no mark, nor any certain Rule to judge it, it is a device that may evacuate any thing we have a mind to, it was not done *Conciliariter*, that is, not according to our mind; for *Conciliariter* is a fine new nothing, that may signifie what you
4. please. Fourthly, but other devices yet more pretty they have: As, Whether the Councell of *Lateran* was a Generall Councell or no, they know not, (no nor will not know) which is a wise and plaine reservation of their own advantages, to make it
5. Generall or not Generall, as shall serve their turns. Fifthly, as for the Councell of *Florence*, they are not sure, whether it hath defin'd the Question *satis apertè*; *apertè* they will grant, if you
6. will allow them not *satis apertè*. Sixthly and lastly, the Councell of *Pisa* is *neq; approbatum neq; reprobatum*, which is the greatest folly of all and most prodigious vanity; so that by something or other, either they were not conven'd lawfully, or

Bellar. de conc. l. 1. c. 8.

they

they did not proceed *Conciliariter*, or 'tis not certain that the Councell was Generall or no, or whether the Councell were *approbatum*, or *reprobatum*. or elſe it is *partim confirmatum partim reprobatum*, or elſe it is *neq; approbatum neq; reprobatum*; By one of theſe wayes or a device like to theſe, all Councels and all Decrees ſhall be made to ſignifie nothing, and to have no Authority.

3. There is no Generall Councell that hath determined that a Generall Councell is infallible: No Scripture hath recorded it; no Tradition univerſall hath tranſmitted to us any ſuch propoſition; So that we muſt receive the Authority at a lower rate, and upon a leſſe probability then the things conſigned by that Authority. And it is ſtrange that the Decrees of Councels ſhould be eſteem'd authentick and infallible, and yet it is not infallibly certain, that the Councels themſelves are infallible, becauſe the beliefe of the Councels infallibility is not prov'd to us by any medium, but ſuch as may deceive us. *Numb.* 7.

4. But the beſt inſtance that Councels are ſome and may all be deceived, is the contradiction of one Councell to another; for in that caſe both cannot be true, and which of them is true, muſt belong to another judgement, which is leſſe then the ſolennity of a Generall Councell; and the determination of this matter can be of no greater certainty after it is concluded, then when it was propounded as a Queſtion, being it is to be determin'd by the ſame Authority or by a leſſe then it ſelfe. But for this allegation, we cannot want inſtances; The Councell of *Trent* allowes picturing of God the Father; The Councell of *Nice* altogether diſallowes it; The ſame *Nicene* Councell, which was the ſeventh Generall, allows of picturing Chriſt in the form of a Lamb; But the ſixth Synod by no meanes will endure it, as *Caranza* affirms: The Councell of *Neocaſarea* confirm'd by *Leo* IV. *diſt.* 20. *de libellis*, and approv'd by the firſt *Nicene* Councell as it is ſaid in the ſeventh Seſſion of the Councell of *Florence*, forbids ſecond Marriages, and impoſes Penances on them that are married the ſecond time, forbidding Prieſts to be preſent at ſuch Marriage Feaſts: Beſides, that this is expreſly againſt the Doctrine of S. *Paul*, it is alſo againſt the *Numb.* 8. Seſſ. 25. Act. 2. Can. 82.

Cap. 1. the Doctine of the Councell of *Laodicea* which took off ſuch Penances, and pronounced ſecond Marriages to be free and lawfull: Nothing is more diſcrepant then the third Councell of *Carthage* and the Councell of *Laodicea*, about aſſignation of the Canon of Scripture, and yet the ſixth Generall Synod approves both: And I would faine know if all Generall Councels are of the ſame mind with the Fathers of the Councell of *Carthage*, who reckon into the Canon five Books of *Solomon*. I

L.17.de cul. Dei.c.20. am ſure S. *Auſtin* reckoned but three, and I think all Chriſtendome beſide are of the ſame opinion. And if we look into the title of the Law *de Conciliis*, called *Concordantia diſcordantiarum*, we ſhall find inſtances enough to confirm that the Decrees of ſome Councels are contradictory to others, and that no wit can reconcile them: And whether they did or no, that they might diſagree, and former Councels be corrected by later, was the beliefe of the Doctors in thoſe Ages in which the beſt and moſt famous Councels were conven'd, as appears in that famous ſaying of S. *Auſtin* ſpeaking concerning the rebaptizing of Hereticks; and how much the *Africans* were deceived in that Queſtion, he anſwers the Allegation of the Biſhops Letters, and thoſe Nationall Councels which confirmed

L.2.de bapt. Donat.c.3. S. *Cyprians* opinion by ſaying that they were no finall determination. For *Epiſcoporum literæ emendari poſſunt à Conciliis nationalibus, Concilia nationalia à plenariis, ipſaq; plenaria priora à poſterioribus emendari.* Not only the occaſion of the Queſtion being a matter not of fact, but of Faith, as being inſtanc'd in the Queſtion of rebaptization: but alſo the very fabrick and œconomy of the words, put by all the anſwers of thoſe men who think themſelves preſſed with the Authority of S. *Auſtin*. For as Nationall Councels may correct the Biſhops Letters, and Generall Councels may correct Nationall, ſo the later Generall may correct the former, that is, have contrary and better Decrees of manners, and better determinations in matters of faith. And from hence hath riſen a Queſtion whether is to be received the former or the later Councels, in caſe they contradict each other. The former are nearer the fountaines Apoſtolicall, the later are of greater conſideration; The firſt, have more Authority, the later more reaſon; The firſt are more venerable, the later more inquiſitive and ſeeing.

And

And now what rule ſhall we have to determine our beliefes, whether to Authority, or Reaſon, the Reaſon and the Authority both of them not being the higheſt in their kinde, both of them being repudiable, and at moſt but probable? And here it is that this great uncertainty is ſuch as not to determine any body, but fit to ſerve every body; and it is ſport to ſee that *Bellarmine* will by all meanes have the Councell of *Carthage* preferr'd before the Councell of *Laodicea*, becauſe it is later, and yet he preferres the ſecond *Nicene* * Councell before the Councell of *Frankfurt*, becauſe it is elder: S. *Auſtin* would have the former Generals to be mended by the later; but *Iſidore* in *Gratian* ſayes when Councels doe differ *ſtandum eſſe antiquioribus*, the elder muſt carry it: And indeed theſe probables are buskins to ſerve every foot, and they are like *magnum & parvum*, they have nothing of their own, all that they have is in compariſon of others; ſo theſe topicks have nothing of reſolute and dogmaticall truth, but in relation to ſuch ends as an intereſſed perſon hath a mind to ſerve upon them.

L. 2. de Conc. c. 8. § reſpondeo in primis.

* Ibid. § de Concilio autem.

Diſt. 20. Can. Domino Sancto.

5. There are many Councels corrupted, and many pretended and alledged, when there were no ſuch things, both which make the topick of the Authority of Councels to be little and inconſiderable: There is a Councell brought to light in the edition of Councels by *Binius*, viz. *Sinveſſanum*, pretended to be kept in the year 303, but it was ſo private till then, that we find no mention of it in any ancient Record: Neither *Euſebius*, nor *Ruffinus*, S. *Hierom*, nor *Socrates*, *Sozomen*, nor *Theodoret*, nor *Eutropius*, nor *Bede* knew any thing of it, and the eldeſt allegation of it is by Pope *Nicholas* I, in the ninth Century. And he that ſhall conſider that 300 Biſhops in the midſt of horrid Perſecutions (for ſo then they were) are pretended to have conven'd, will need no greater Argument to ſuſpect the impoſture; beſides, he that was the framer of the engine did not lay his ends together handſomely, for it is ſaid that the depoſition of *Marcellinus* by the Synod was told to *Diocletian*, when he was in the *Perſian* Warre, when as it is known before that time he had return'd to *Rome*, and triumph'd for his *Perſian* Conqueſt as *Euſebius* in his Chronicle reports: And this is ſo plain that *Binius* and *Baronius* pretend the Text to be corrupted, & to go to * mend it.

Numb. 9.

* Pro [cum eſſet in bello Perſarum] legi volunt [cum reverſus eſſet è bello Perſarum] *Euſeb. Chronicon vide Binium in notis ad Concil. Sinveſſanum. Tom. 1. Concil. & Baron. Annal. Tom. 3.* A. D. 303. *Num.* 107.

it by such an emendation as is a plain contradiction to the sense, and that so un-clerk-like, *viz.* by putting in two words and leaving out one, which whether it may be allowed them by any licence lesse then Poeticall let Criticks judge. S. *Gregory* saith that the *Constantinopolitans* had corrupted the Synod of *Chalcedon*, and that he suspected the same concerning the *Ephesine* Councell: And in the fifth Synod there was a notorious prevarication, for there were false Epistles of Pope *Vigilius* and *Menna* the Patriarch of *Constantinople* inserted, and so they passed for authentick till they were discovered in the sixth Generall Synod, Actions the 12. and 14: And not only false Decrees and Actions may creep into the Codes of Councels; but sometimes the authority of a learned man may abuse the Church with pretended Decrees, of which there is no Copy or shadow in the Code it selfe: And thus *Thomas Aquinas* layes that the Epistle to the *Hebrewes* was reckoned in the Canon by the *Nicene* Councell, no shadow of which appears in those Copies we now have of it; and this pretence and the reputation of the man prevail'd so farre with *Melchior Canus* the learned Bishop of *Canaries*, that he believ'd it upon this ground, *Vir sanctus rem adeo gravem non astrueret, nisi compertum habuisset*; and there are many things which have prevail'd upon lesse reason and a more slight Authority. And that very Councell of *Nice*, hath not only been pretended by *Aquinas*, but very much abused by others, and its Authority and great reputation hath made it more lyable to the fraud and pretences of idle people: For whereas the *Nicene* Fathers made but twenty Canons, for so many and no more were received by [a] *Cecilian* of *Carthage*, that was at *Nice* in the Councell; by S. [b] *Austin*, and 200 *African* Bishops with him, by S. [c] *Cyrill* of *Alexandria*, by [d] *Atticus* of *Constantinople*, by *Ruffinus*, [e] *Isidore* and *Theodoret*, as [f] *Baronius* witnesses, yet there are fourscore lately found out in an *Arabian* M. S. and published in Latine by *Turrian* and *Alfonsus* of *Pisa* Jesuites surely, and like to be masters of the mint. And not only the Canons, but the very Acts of the *Nicene* Councell are false and spurious, and are so confessed by *Baronius*; though how he and [g] *Lindanus* will be reconcil'd upon the point, I neither know well nor much care.

I. 5. Ep. 14. ad Narsem.

Comment. in Hebr.

[a] Con. Carthag. VI. cap. 9.
[b] Con. African.
[c] Ibid. c. 102. & c. 135.
[d] Lib. 1. Eccl. Hist. c. 6.
[e] In princ. Con. de Synod. Princ.
[f] Baronius, tom. 3. *A.D.* 325. n. 156. Tom. 3. ad *A.D.* 325. n. 62 63.
[g] Panopl. l. 2. c. 6.

Now

Now if one Councell be corrupted, we ſee by the inſtance of S. *Gregory*, that another may be ſuſpected and ſo all; becauſe he found the Councell of *Chalcedon* corrupted, he ſuſpected alſo the *Epheſine*, and another might have ſuſpected more, for the *Nicene* was tampered fouly with, and ſo three of the foure Generals were ſullied and made ſuſpicious, and therefore we could not be ſecure of any; If falſe Acts be inſerted in one Councell, who can truſt the actions of any, unleſſe he had the keeping the Records himſelfe, or durſt ſwear for the Regiſter: And if a very learned man (as *Thomas Aquinas* was,) did either wilfully deceive us, or was himſelfe ignorantly abuſed in Allegation of a Canon which was not, it is but a very fallible Topick at the beſt, and the moſt holy man that is, may be abuſed himſelfe, and the wiſeſt may deceive others.

6. And laſtly, To all this and to the former inſtances, by way of Corollary, I adde ſome more particulars in which it is notorious that Councels Generall, and Nationall, that is, ſuch as were either Generall by Originall, or by adoption into the Canon of the Catholike Church did erre, and were actually deceived. The firſt Councell of *Toledo* admits to the Communion him that hath a Concubine, ſo he have no wife beſides, and this Councell is approved by Pope *Leo* in the 92 Epiſtle to *Ruſticus* Biſhop of *Narbona*: *Gratian* ſayes that the Councell meanes by a Concubine, a wife married *ſine dote & ſolennitate*; but this is dawbing with untemper'd mortar. For though it was a cuſtome amongſt the Jewes to diſtinguiſh Wives from their Concubines, by Dowry and legall Solennities, yet the Chriſtian diſtinguiſhed them no otherwiſe, then as lawfull and unlawfull, then as Chaſtity and Fornication: And beſides, if by a Concubine is meant a lawfull wife without a Dowry, to what purpoſe ſhould the Councell make a Law that ſuch a one might be admitted to the Communion? for I ſuppoſe it was never thought to be a Law of Chriſtianity, that a man ſhould have a Portion with his Wife, nor he that married a poore Virgin ſhould deſerve to be Excommunicate. So that *Gratian* and his Followers are preſt ſo with this Canon, that to avoid the impiety of it, they expound it to a ſignification without ſenſe or purpoſe. But the buſineſſe then was, that Adultery

Numb. 10.

Diſt. 34. can. omnibus.

was

was so publike and notorious a practise that the Councell did chuse rather to endure simple Fornication, that by such permission of a lesse, they might slacken the publike customs of a greater, just as at *Rome* they permit Stewes to prevent unnaturall sinnes; But that by a publike sanction Fornicators, habitually and notoriously such, should be admitted to the holy Communion was an act of Priests, so unfit for Priests, that no excuse can make it white or cleane. The Councell of *Wormes* does authorize a superstitious custome at that time too much used, of discovering stoln goods by the holy Sacrament, which [a] *Aquinas* justly condemns for Superstition. The [b] sixth Synod separates persons lawfully married upon an accusation and crime of heresy: The Roman Councell under [c] Pope *Nicholas* II. defin'd that not only the Sacrament of Christs body, but the very body it selfe of our blessed Saviour is handled and broke by the hands of the Priest, and chewed by the teeth of the Communicants, which is a manifest errour derogatory from the truth of Christs beatificall Resurrection, and glorification in the Heavens, and disavowed by the Church of *Rome* it selfe: But *Bellarmine* that answers all the Arguments in the world, whither it be possible or not possible, would faine make the matter faire, and the Decree tolerable, for sayes he, the Decree meanes that the body is broken not in it selfe but in the sign, and yet the Decree sayes that not only the Sacrament (which if any thing be, is certainly the sign) but the very body it selfe is broken and champed with hands and teeth respectively; which indeed was nothing but a plaine over-acting the Article in contradiction to *Berengarius*. And the answer of *Bellarmine* is not sense; for he denies that the body it selfe is broken in it selfe (that was the errour we charg'd upon the Roman Synod) and the sign abstracting from the body is not broken, (for that was the opinion that Councell condemn'd in *Berengarius*) but sayes *Bellarmine*, the body in the sign: What's that? for neither the sign, nor the body, nor both together are broken: For if either of them distinctly, they either rush upon the errour which the Roman Synod condemn'd in *Berengarius*, or upon that which they would fain excuse in Pope *Nicholas*; but if both are broken then 'tis true to affirm

Cap. 3.

[a] Part. 3. q 80. a. 6. ad 3m.
[b] Can. 72.
[c] Can ego Berengar. de consecrat. dist. 2.

Lib. 2. c. 8. de Concil.

it

it of either, and then the Councell is blasphemous in saying that Christ's glorified body is passible and frangible by naturall manducation: So that it is and it is not, it is not this way, and yet it is no way else, but it is some way, and they know not how, and the Councell spoke blasphemy, but it must be made innocent; and therefore, it was requisite a cloud of a distinction should be raised, that the unwary Reader might be amused, and the Decree scape untoucht; but the truth is, they that undertake to justifie all that other men say, must be more subtle then they that said it, and must use such distinctions which possibly the first Authors did not understand. But I will multiply no more instances, for what instance soever I shall bring, some or other will be answering it, which thing is so farre from satisfying me in the particulars, that it increases the difficulty in the generall, and satisfies me in my first beliefe: For * if no Decrees of Councels can make against them though they seeme never so plain against them, then let others be allowed the same liberty, (and there is all the reason in the world they should) and no Decree shall conclude against any Doctrine, that they have already entertain'd; and by this meanes the Church is no fitter instrument to Decree Controversies then the Scripture it selfe, there being as much obscurity and disputing in the sense, and the manner, and the degree, and the competency, and the obligation of the Decree of a Councell, as of a place of Scripture. And what are we the nearer for a Decree, if any Sophister shall think his elusion enough to contest against the Authority of a Councell? yet this they doe, that pretend higheſt for their Authority, which consideration or some like it might possibly make *Gratian* preferre S. *Hierom's* single Testimony before a whole Councell, because hee had Scripture of his side; which sayes, that the Authority of Councels is not αὐτόπιστον, and that Councels may possibly recede from their Rule, from Scripture; and in that case, a single person proceeding according to Rule is a better Argument; which indeed was the saying of *Panormitan*, *in concernentibus fidem etiam dictum unius privatæ esset dicto Papæ aut totius Concilii præferendum, si ille moveretur melioribus Argumentis.*

* Illa demùm eis videntur edicta & Concilia quæ in rem suam faciunt; reliqua non pluris æstimant quam conventum mulierculanum in textrinâ vel thermis. *Ludo. Vives in Scholiis lib. 20. Aug. de Civit. Dei. c. 26.*

36. q. 2. c. placuit.

Part. 1. de election. Et elect. potest. cap. significasti.

Numb. 11. Athanas. lib. de Synod. Frustra igitur circumcursitantes prætexunt ob hidem se Synodos postulare, cum sit Divina Scriptura omnibus potentior.

I end this Discourse with representing the words of *Gregory Nazianzen* in his Epistle to *Procopius*; *Ego si vera scribere oportet ita animo affectus sum, ut omnia Episcoporum Concilia fugiam, quoniam nullius Concilii finem latum fausturnq; vidi, nec quod depulsionem malorum potius quam accessionem & incrementum habuerit:* But I will not be so severe and dogmatical against them: For I believe many Councels to have been cald with sufficient Authority, to have been managed with singular piety and prudence, and to have been finished with admirable successe and truth. And where we find such Councels, he that will not with all veneration believe their Decrees, and receive their sanctions, understands not that great duty he owes to them who have the care of our soules, whose *faith we are bound to follow* (saith S. *Paul*) that is so long as they follow Christ, and certainly many Councels have done so: But this was then when the publike interest of Christendome was better conserv'd in determining a true Article, then in finding a discreet temper, or a wise expedient to satisfie disagreeing persons; (As the Fathers at *Trent* did, and the *Lutherans* and *Calvinists* did at *Sendomir* in *Polonia*; and the *Sublapsarians* and *Supralapsarians* did at *Dort*:) It was in Ages when the summe of Religion did not consist in maintaining the *Grandezza* of the Papacy; where there was no order of men with a fourth Vow upon them to advance S. *Peters* Chaire; when there was no man, nor any company of men, that esteem'd themselves infallible, and therefore they searched for truth as if they meant to find it, and would believe it if they could see it prov'd, not resolv'd to prove it because they had upon chance or interest believ'd it; then they had rather have spoken a truth, then upheld their reputation, but only in order to truth. This was done sometimes, and when it was done, God's Spirit never fail'd them, but gave them such assistances as were sufficient to that good end for which they were Assembled, and did implore his aid: And therefore it is that the foure generall Councels so called by way of eminency, have gained so great a reputation above all others, not because they had a better promise, or more speciall assistances, but because they proceeded better according to the Rule, with lesse

Heb. 13. 7.

faction

faction, without ambition and temporall ends.

And yet thoſe very Aſſemblies of Biſhops had no Autho- *Numb.* 12.
rity by their Decrees to make a Divine Faith, or to conſtitute new objects of neceſſary Credence; they made nothing true that was not ſo before, and therefore they are to be apprehended in the nature of excellent Guides, and whoſe Decrees are moſt certainly to determine all thoſe who have no Argument to the contrary of greater force and efficacy then the Authority or reaſons of the Councell. And there is a duty owing to every Pariſh Prieſt, and to every Dioeceſan Biſhop; theſe are appointed over us and to anſwer for our ſoules, and are therefore morally to guide us, as reaſonable Creatures are to be guided, that is, by reaſon and diſcourſe: For in things of judgement and underſtanding, they are but in ſorme next above Beaſts, that are to be ruled by the imperiouſneſſe and abſoluteneſſe of Authority, unleſſe the Authority be Divine, that is, infallible. Now then in a juſter height, but ſtill in its true proportion, Aſſemblies of Biſhops are to guide us with a higher Authority, becauſe in reaſon it is ſuppoſed they will doe it better, with more Argument and certainty, and with Decrees, which have the advantage by being the reſults of many diſcourſes of very wiſe and good men: But that the Authority of generall Councels, was never eſteem'd abſolute, infallible and unlimited appears in this, that before they were obliging, it was neceſſary that each particular Church reſpectively ſhould accept them, *Concurrente univerſali totius Eccleſiæ conſenſu, &c. in declaratione veritatum quæ credenda ſunt &c.* That's the way of making the Decrees of Councels become authentik, and be turn'd into a Law as *Gerſon* obſerves; and till they did, their Decrees were but a dead letter (and therefore it is that theſe later Popes have ſo labour'd, that the Councell of *Trent* ſhould be received in *France*; and *Carolus Molineus* a great Lawyer, and of the Roman Communion, diſputed * againſt the reception,) and this is a known condition in the Canon Law, but it proves plainly that the Decrees of Councels have their Authority from the voluntary ſubmiſſion of the particular Churches, not from the prime ſanction and conſtitution of the Councell. And there is great reaſon it ſhould; for as the repreſentative

Vid. S. Auguſt. l. 1. c. 18. de bapt. contr. Donat.

* So did the third Eſtate of *France* in the Convention of the three Eſtates under *Lewis* the 13th. earneſtly contend againſt it.

body of the Church derives all power from the diffuſive body which is repreſented, ſo it reſolves into it, and though it may have all the legall power, yet it hath not all the naturall; for more able men may be unſent, then ſent; and they who are ſent may be wrought upon by ſtratagem, which cannot happen to the whole diffuſive Church; it is therefore moſt fit that ſince the legall power, that is, the externall was paſſed over to the body repreſentative, yet the efficacy of it, and the internall ſhould ſo ſtill remaine in the diffuſive, as to have power to conſider whether their repreſentatives did their duty yea or no, and ſo to proceed accordingly: For unleſſe it be in matters of juſtice, in which the intereſt of a third perſon is concern'd, no man will or can be ſuppoſed to paſſe away all power from himſelfe of doing himſelfe right, in matters perſonall, proper, and of ſo high concernment: It is moſt unnaturall and unreaſonable. But beſides, that they are excellent inſtruments of peace, the beſt humane Judicatories in the world, rare Sermons for the determining a point in Controverſy, and the greateſt probability from humane Authority, beſides theſe advantages (I ſay) I know nothing greater that generall Councels can pretend to with reaſon and Argument ſufficient to ſatisfie any wiſe man: And as there was never any Councell ſo generall, but it might have been more generall; for in reſpect of the whole Church, even *Nice* it ſelfe was but a ſmall Aſſembly; ſo there is no Decree ſo well conſtituted, but it may be prov'd by an Argument higher then the Authority of the Councell: And therefore generall Councels, and Nationall, and Provinciall, and Dioeceſan in their ſeverall degrees, are excellent Guides for the Prophets and directions and inſtructions for their Propheſyings, but not of weight and Authority to reſtraine their Liberty ſo wholy, but that they may diſſent when they ſee a reaſon ſtrong enough ſo to perſwade them, as to be willing upon the confidence of that reaſon and their own ſincerity, to anſwer to God for ſuch their modeſty, and peaceable, but (as they believe) their neceſſary diſagreeing.

SECT.

SECT. VII.

Of the fallibility of the Pope, and the uncertainty of his Expounding Scripture, and resolving Questions.

BUt since the Question between the Councell and the Pope grew high, there have not wanted abettors so confident on the Popes behalfe, as to believe Generall Councels to be nothing but Pompes and Solennities of the Catholike Church, and that all the Authority of determining Controversies is formally and effectually in the Pope. And therefore to appeale from the Pope to a future Councell is a heresy, yea, and Treason too said Pope *Pius* II, and therefore it concerns us now to be wise and wary. But before I proceed, I must needs remember that Pope *Pius* II, while he was the wise and learned *Æneas Sylvius*, was very confident for the preheminence of a Councell, and gave a merry reason why more Clerks were for the Popes then the Councell, though the truth was on the other side, even because the Pope gives Bishopricks and Abbeys, but Councels give none; and yet as soone as he was made Pope, as if he had been inspired, his eyes were open to see the great priviledges of S. *Peters* Chaire, which before he could not see, being amused with the truth, or else with the reputation of a Generall Councell. But however, there are many that hope to make it good, that the Pope is the Universall and the infallible Doctor, that he breathes Decrees as Oracles, that to dissent from any of his Cathedrall determinations is absolute heresy, the Rule of Faith being nothing else but conformity to the Chaire of *Peter*. So that here we have met a restraint of Prophecy indeed; but yet to make amends, I hope we shall have an infallible Guide, and when a man is in Heaven, he will never complaine that his choyce is taken from him, and that he is confin'd to love and to admire, since his love and his admiration is fixt, upon that which makes him happy, even upon God himselfe. And in the Church of *Rome* there is in a lower degree, but in a true proportion as little cause to be troubled, that we are confin'd to believe just

Numb. 8. Epist. ad Norimberg. Patrum & avorum nostrorum tempore pauci audebant dicere Papam esse supra Concilium. l. 1. *de gestis Concil. Basil.*

so, and no choice left us for our understandings to discover or our wills to chuse, because though we be limited, yet we are pointed out where we ought to rest, we are confin'd to our Center, and there where our understandings will be satisfied, and therefore will be quiet, and where after all our strivings, studies and endeavours we desire to come, that is, to truth, for there we are secur'd to find it, because we have a Guide that is infallible: If this prove true, we are well enough. But if it be false or uncertain, it were better we had still kept our liberty, then be cozened out of it with gay pretences. This then we must consider.

Numb. 2. And here we shall be oppressed with a cloud of Witnesses: For what more plaine then the Commission given to *Peter*? *Thou art* Peter, *and upon this Rock will I build my Church.* And *to thee will I give the Keyes.* And again, *for thee have I prayed that thy faith faile not; but thou when thou art converted confirm thy brethren*; And again, *If thou loveſt me feed my sheep*: Now nothing of this being spoken to any of the other Apostles, by one of these places S. *Peter* must needs be appointed Foundation or Head of the Church, and by consequence he is to rule and govern all. By some other of these places he is made the supreme Pastor, and he is to teach and determine all, and inabled with an infallible power so to doe: And in a right understanding of these Authorities, the Fathers speak great things of the Chaire of *Peter*; for we are as much bound to believe that all this was spoken to *Peters* Successors, as to his Person; that must by all meanes be supposed, and so did the old Doctors, who had as much certainty of it as we have, and no more; but yet let's hear what they have said, [a] *To this Church by reason of its more powerfull principality, it is necessary all Churches round about should Convene*: .... *In this, Tradition Apostolicall always was observed, and therefore to communicate with this Bishop with this* [b] *Church, was to be in Communion with the Church Catholike*: .... [b] *To this Church errour or perfidiousnesse cannot have accesse*: .... [c] *Against this Sea the gates of Hell cannot prevaile*: .... [d] *For we know this Church to be built upon a Rock*: .... *And whoever eats the Lamb not within this House, is prophane; he that is not in the Ark of* Noah

[a] Irenæ. contra. hæres. l. 3. c. 3.
[b] Ambr. de obitu Salyri, & l. 1. Ep. 4. ad Imp. Cypr. Ep. 52.
[b] Cypr. Ep. 55. ad Cornel.
[c] S. Austin. in Psal. contra. partem. Donat.
[d] Hieron. Ep. 57. ad Damasum.

Noah *periſhes in the inundation of waters. He that gathers not with this Biſhop he ſcatters; and he that belongeth not to Chriſt, muſt needs belong to Antichriſt.* And that's his finall ſentence: But if you would have all this prov'd by an infallible Argument, [c] *Optatus* of *Milevis* in *Africa* ſupplies it to us from the very name of *Peter*: For therefore Chriſt gave him the cognomination of *Cephas* ἀπὸ τῆς κεφαλῆς, to ſhew that S. *Peter* was the viſible Head of the Catholike Church. *Dignum patellâ operculum!* This long harangue muſt needs be full of tragedy to all them that take liberty to themſelves to follow Scripture and their beſt Guides, if it happens in that liberty that they depart from the perſwaſions or the Communion of *Rome*: But indeed, if with the peace of the Biſhops of *Rome* I may ſay it, this Scene is the moſt unhandſomely laid, and the worſt carried of any of thoſe pretences that have lately abuſed Chriſtendome.

[c] L. 2. contra Parmenian.

1. Againſt the Allegations of Scripture, I ſhall lay no greater prejudice then this, that if a perſon diſ-intereſted ſhould ſee them, and conſider what the products of them might poſſibly be, the laſt thing that he would think of, would be how that any of theſe places ſhould ſerve the ends or pretences of the Church of *Rome*: For to inſtance in one of the particulars, that man had need have a ſtrong fancy who imagines that becauſe Chriſt pray'd for S. *Peter*, that (being he had deſign'd him to be one of thoſe upon whoſe preaching and Doctrine he did meane to conſtitute a Church) *that his faith might not faile*, (for it was neceſſary that no bitterneſſe or ſtopping ſhould be in one of the firſt ſprings, leaſt the current be either ſpoil'd or obſtructed) that therefore the faith of Pope *Alexander* VI, or *Gregory*, or *Clement* 1500 years after, ſhould be be preſerved by vertue of that prayer, which the forme of words, the time, the occaſion, the manner of the addreſſe, the effect it ſelfe, and all the circumſtances of the action and perſon did determine to be perſonall: And when it was more then perſonall, S. *Peter* did not repreſent his Succeſſors at *Rome*, but the whole Catholike Church, ſayes *Aquinas* and the Divines of the Univerſity of *Paris*, *Volunt enim pro ſolâ Eccleſiâ eſſe oratum*, ſayes *Bellarmine* of them, and the gloſſe upon the Canon Law

Numb. 9.

22ae. q. 2. a. 6. ar 6. ad 3m.

L. 4. de Romam. Pont. c. 3. § 10.

Law plainly denies the effect of this prayer at all to appertain to the Pope: *Quare de quâ Ecclesia intelligas quod hoc dicitur quod non possit errare, si de ipso Papâ qui Ecclesia dicitur? sed certum est quod Papa errare potest .... Respondeo ipsa Congregatio fidelium hic dicitur Ecclesia, & talis Ecclesia non potest non esse, nam ipse Dominus orat pro Ecclesiâ, & voluntate labiorum suorum non fraudabitur.* But there is a little danger in this Argument when we well consider it; but it is likely to redound on the head of them whose turns it should serve: For it may be remembred that for all this prayer of Christ for S. *Peter*, the good man fell foully, and denyed his Master shamefully: And shall Christs prayer be of greater efficacy for his Successor, for whom it was made but indirectly and by consequence, then for himselfe, for whom it was directly and in the first intention? And if not, then for all this Argument, the Popes may deny Christ as well as their cheife and Decessor *Peter*. But it would not be forgotten how the Roman Doctors will by no meanes allow that S. *Peter* was then the chiefe Bishop or Pope, when he denyed his Master. But then much lesse was he chosen chiefe Bishop, when the prayer was made for him, because the prayer was made before his fall; that is, before that time in which it is confessed, he was not as yet made Pope: And how then the whole Succession of the Papacy should be intitled to it, passes the length of my hand to span. But then also if it be supposed and allowed, that these words shall intaile infallibility upon the Chaire of *Rome*, why shall not also all the Apostolicall Sees bee infallible as well as *Rome*? why shall not *Constantinople* or *Byzantium* where S. *Andrew* sate? why shall not *Ephesus* where S. *John* sate? or *Jerusalem* where S. *James* sate? for Christ prayed for them all, *ut Pater sanctificaret eos sua veritate*, Joh. 17.

Caus. 21. cap. à recta. q. 1.

29. dist. Anastatius 69. dist. si Papa.

Numb. 4. 2. For [*tibi dabo claves,*] was it personall or not? If it were, then the Bishops of *Rome* have nothing to doe with it: If it were not, then by what Argument will it be made evident that S. *Peter*, in the promise represented only his Successors, and not the whole Colledge of Apostles, and the whole Hierarchy? For if S. *Peter* was chiefe of the Apostles, and Head of the Church, he might faire enough be the representative of the whole

whole Colledge, and receive it in their right as well as his own; which alſo is certain that it was ſo, for the ſame promiſe of binding and looſing, (which certainly was all that the keyes were given for) was made afterward to all the Apoſtles, *Mat.* 18. and the power of remitting and retaining which in reaſon and according to the ſtile of the Church is the ſame thing in other words, was actually given to all the Apoſtles, and unleſſe that was the performing the firſt and ſecond promiſe, we find it not recorded in Scripture how or when or whether yet or no, the promiſe be performed: That promiſe I ſay which did not pertaine to *Peter* principally and by origination, and to the reſt by Communication, ſociety and adherence, but that promiſe which was made to *Peter* firſt, but not for himſelfe, but for all the Colledge and for all their Succeſſors, and then made the ſecond time to them all, without repreſentation but in diffuſion, and perform'd to all alike in preſence except S. *Thomas*. And if he went to S. *Peter* to derive it from him, I know not; I find no record for that, but that Chriſt convey'd the promiſe to him by the ſame Commiſſion, the Church yet never doubted, nor had ſhe any reaſon. But this matter is too notorious: I ſay no more to it, but repeat the words and Argument of S. *Auſtin*, *Si hoc Petro tantum dictum eſt, non facit hoc Eccleſia:* If the Keyes were only given and ſo promiſed to S. *Peter*, that the Church hath not the Keyes, then the Church can neither bind nor looſe, remit nor retaine, which God forbid; if any man ſhould endevour to anſwer this Argument, I leave him and S. *Auſtin* to conteſt it. Tra. 50. in Ioann.

3. For *paſce oves* there is little in that Allegation, beſides the boldneſſe of the Objectors; for were not all the Apoſtles bound to feed Chriſt's ſheep? had they not all the Commiſſion from Chriſt, and Chriſt's Spirit immediately? S. *Paul* had certainly; did not S. *Peter* himſelfe ſay to all the Biſhops of *Pontus*, *Galatia*, *Cappadocia*, *Aſia*, and *Bithinia*, that they ſhould feed the flock of God, and the great Biſhop and Shepheard ſhould give them an immarceſcible Crown; plainly implying, that from whence they derived their Authority, from him they were ſure of a reward: In purſuance of which S. *Cyprian* laid his Argument upon this baſis, *Nam cum ſtatutum ſit omnibus* *Numb.* 5. L. 1. Epiſt. 3.

nobis, &c. & singulis pastoribus portio gregis, &c. Did not S. *Paul* call to the Bishops of *Ephesus* to feed the flock of God, of which the holy Ghost hath made them Bishops or Over-seers? and that this very Commission was spoken to *Peter* not in a personall, but a publike capacity, and in him spoke to all the Apostles we see attested by S. *Austin*, and S. *Ambrose* and generally by all Antiquity; and it so concern'd even every Priest that *Damasus* was willing enough to have S. *Hierom* explicate many questions for him. And *Liberius* writes an Epistle to *Athanasius* with much modesty requiring his advice in a Question of Faith, ἵνα κἀγὼ πεισθεὶς ὦ ἀδιακρίτως, φέρε ὧν ἀξιοῖς κελεύειν μοι, That I also may be perswaded without all doubting of those things which you shall be pleased to command me. Now *Liberius* needed not to have troubled himselfe to have writ into the East to *Athanasius*; for if he had but seated himselfe in his Chaire, and made the dictate, the result of his pen and inke would certainly have taught him and all the Church; but that the good Pope was ignorant that either *pasce oves* was his own Charter, and Prerogative, or that any other words of Scripture had made him to be infallible, or if he was not ignorant of it, he did very ill to complement himselfe out of it. So did all those Bishops of *Rome* that in that troublesome and unprofitable Question of Easter, being unsatisfied in the supputation of the *Egyptians*, and the definitions of the Mathematicall Bishops of *Alexandria*, did yet require and intreat S. *Ambrose* to tell them his opinion, as he himselfe witnesses; If *pasce oves* belongs only to the Pope by primary title, in these cases the sheep came to feed the Shepherd, which though it was well enough in the thing, is very ill for the pretensions of the Roman Bishops; and if we consider how little many of the Popes have done toward feeding the sheep of Christ, we shall hardly determine which is the greater prevarication, that the Pope should claime the whole Commission to be granted to him, or that the execution of the Commission should be wholly passed over to others; and it may be there is a mystery in it, that since S. *Peter* sent a Bishop with his staffe to raise up a Disciple of his from the dead, who was afterward Bishop of *Triers*, the Popes of *Rome* never weare a Pastorall staffe

De agone Christi, c. 30.

Epist. ad Athanas. apud Athanas. tom. 1. pag 42. Paris.

L. 10. Epist. 83.

ſtaffe except it be in that Dioceſſe (ſayes *Aquinas*) for great reaſon that he who does not doe the office, ſhould not beare the Symbol; but a man would think that the Popes Maſter of the Ceremonies was ill adviſed not to aſſigne a Paſtorall ſtaffe to him, who pretends the Commiſſion of *paſce oves* to belong to him by prime right and origination. But this is not a buſineſſe to be merry in. M.4.Sent.dis. 24.

But the great ſupport is expected from *Tu es Petrus & ſuper hanc Petram ædificabo Eccleſiam, &c.* Now there being ſo great difference in the expoſition of theſe words, by perſons diſ-intereſſed, who, if any, might be allowed to judge in this Queſtion, it is certain that neither one ſenſe nor other can be obtruded for an Article of faith, much leſſe as a Catholicon inſtead of all, by conſtituting an Authority which ſhould guide us in all Faith, and determine us in all Queſtions: For if the Church was not built upon the perſon of *Peter*, then his Succeſſors can challenge nothing from this inſtance; now that it was the confeſſion of *Peter* upon which the Church was to rely for ever, we have witneſſes very credible, [a] S.*Ignatius*, S.[b] *Baſil*, [c] S.*Hilary*, [d] S.*Gregory Nyſſen*, [e] S.*Gregory* the Great, [f] S.*Auſtin*. [g] S.*Cyrill* of *Alexandria*, [h] *Iſidore Peluſiot*, and very many more. And although all theſe witneſſes concurring cannot make a propoſition to be true, yet they are ſufficient witneſſes, that it was not the Univerſall beliefe of Chriſtendome that the Church was built upon S.*Peters* perſon. Cardinall *Perron* hath a fine fancy to elude this variety of Expoſition, and the conſequents of it; For (ſaith he) theſe Expoſitions are not contrary or excluſive of each other, but incluſive and conſequent to each other: For the Church is founded cauſally upon the confeſſion of S.*Peter*, formally upon the miniſtry of his perſon, and this was a reward or a conſequent of the former: So that theſe Expoſitions are both true, but they are conjoyn'd as mediate and immediate, direct and collaterall, literall and morall, originall and perpetuall, acceſſory and temporall, the one conſign'd at the beginning, the other introduc'd upon occaſion: For before the ſpring of the *Arrian* hereſy, the Fathers expounded theſe words of the perſon of *Peter*; but after the *Arrians* troubled them, the Fathers finding great Authority, and *Energy* in this confeſſion *Numb.* 6.

a Ad Philadelph.
b Seleucorat. 25.
c L.6. de Trinit.
d De Trinitate adverſus Iudæos.
e L.3.Ep.33.
f In 1. Eph. Ioann.tr.10.
g De Trinit. l.4.
h L.1.Ep.235.

of *Peter* for the establishment of the naturall filiation of the Son of God, to advance the reputation of these words and the force of the Argument, gave themselves lience to expound these words to the present advantage, and to make the confession of *Peter* to be the foundation of the Church, that if the *Arrians* should encounter this Authority, they might with more prejudice to their persons declaime against their cause by saying they overthrew the foundation of the Church. Besides that this answer does much dishonour the reputation of the Fathers integrity, and makes their interpretations lesse credible as being made not of knowledge or reason but of necessity and to serve a present turn, it is also false: For * *Ignatius* expounds it in a spirituall sense, which also the Liturgy attributed to S. *James* cals ἐπὶ πίστει τῆς πίστεως: And *Origen* expounds it mystically to a third purpose, but exclusively to this: And all these were before the Arrian Controversy. But if it be lawfull to make such unproved observations, it would have been to better purpose, and more reason to have observed it thus: The Fathers so long as the Bishop of *Rome* kept himselfe to the limits prescrib'd him by Christ, and indulged to him by the Constitution or concession of the Church, were unwary and apt to expound this place of the person of *Peter*; but when the Church began to enlarge her phylacteries by the favour of Princes, and the Sunshine of a prosperous fortune, and the Pope by the advantage of the Imperiall Seat, and other accidents began to invade upon the other Bishops and Patriarchs, then that he might have no colour from Scripture for such new pretensions, they did most generally turn the stream of their expositions from the person to the confession of *Peter*, and declar'd that to be the foundation of the Church. And thus I have requited fancy with fancy; but for the maine point, that these two Expositions are inclusive of each other, I find no warrant; for though they may consist together well enough, if Christ had so intended them; yet unlesse it could be shown by some circumstance of the Text, or some other extrinsecall Argument that they must be so, and that both senses were actually intended, it is but *gratis dictum* and a begging of the Question, to say that they are so, and the fancy so new, that when S. *Austin* had

* Epist. ad Philadelph. In c. 16. Mat. tract. 1.

expounded

expounded this place of the perſon of *Peter*, he reviewes it againe, and in his Retractations leaves every man to his liberty, which to take; as having nothing certaine in this Article: which had been altogether needleſſe if he had believed them to be incluſively in each other, neither of them had need to have beene retracted, both were alike true, both of them might have been believed: But I ſaid the fancy was new, and I had reaſon; for it was ſo unknown till yeſterday, that even the late Writers of his own ſide, expound the words of the confeſſion of S. *Peter* excluſively to his perſon or any thing elſe, as is to be ſeen in [a] *Marſilius*, [b] *Petrus de Aliaco* and the gloſſe upon *Diſt.* 19. *can. ita Dominus*, § *ut ſupra*, which alſo was the Interpretation of *Phavorinus Camers* their own Biſhop, from whom they learnt the reſemblance of the word Πέτρος and πέτρα, of which they have made ſo many gay diſcourſes, πέτρα περὶ ἧς πίστις ἀβράγτης κυρίε ἡμῶν Ιησᾶ Χριστᾶ εἰς οἰκοδομὴν ψυχῆς ἐν τῷ ἡγεμονικῷ θεμελίῳ προθεμελιωμένη.

[a] Defenſ. pacis part. 2. c. 28. [b] Recommend. ſacr. Script.

5. But upon condition I may have leave at another time to recede from ſo great and numerous Teſtimony of Fathers, I am willing to believe that it was not the confeſſion of S. *Peter*, but his perſon upon which Chriſt ſaid he would build his Church, or that theſe Expoſitions are conſiſtent with and conſequent to each other. that this confeſſion was the objective foundation of Faith, and Chriſt and his Apoſtles the ſubjective, Chriſt principally, and S. *Peter* inſtrumentally; and yet I underſtand not any advantage will hence accrue to the Sea of *Rome*: For upon S *Peter* it was built, but not alone, for it *was upon the foundation of the Apoſtles and Prophets, Jeſus Chriſt himſelfe being the chief corner ſtone*; and when S. *Paul* reckoned the Oeconomy of Hierarchy, he reckons not *Peter* firſt, and then the Apoſtles. But firſt Apoſtles ſecondarily Prophets, &c. And whatſoever is firſt, either is before all things elſe, or at leaſt nothing is before it: So that at leaſt S. *Peter* is not before all the reſt of the Apoſtles, which alſo S. *Paul* expreſly averres, *I am in nothing inferiour to the very chiefeſt of the Apoſtles*, no not in the very being a Rock and a foundation; and it was of the Church of *Epheſus*, that S. *Paul* ſaid in particular it was *columna & firmamentum veritatis*, that Church was, not excluding others,

Numb. 7.

for they also were as much as she; for so we keep close and be united to the corner stone, although some be master builders, yet all may build, and we have known whole Nations converted by Lay-men and women, who have been builders so farre as to bring them to the corner stone.

Vid. Socrat. l. 1. c. 19. 20. Sozom. l. 2. c. 14. Niceph. l. 14. c. 40.

Numb. 8. 6. But suppose all these things concern S. *Peter* in all the capacities can be with any colour pretended, yet what have the Bishops of *Rome* to doe with this? For how will it appear that these promises and Commissions did relate to him as a particular Bishop, and not as a publike Apostle? Since this later is so much the more likely, because the great pretence of all seemes in reason more proportionable to the founding of a Church, then its continuance: And yet if they did relate to him as a particular Bishop (which yet is a further degree of improbability, removed further from certainty) yet why shall S. *Clement* or *Linus* rather succeed in this great office of headship then S. *John* or any of the Apostles that survived *Peter*? It is no way likely a private person should skip over the head of an Apostle; or why shall his Successors at *Rome* more enjoy the benefit of it then his Successors at *Antioch*, since that he was at *Antioch* and preached there, we have a Divine Authority, but that he did so at *Rome* at most we have but a humane; and if it be replyed that because he dyed at *Rome*, it was Argument enough that there his Successors were to inherit his priviledge, this besides that at most it is but one little degree of probability, and so not of strength sufficient to support an Article of faith; it makes that the great Divine Right of *Rome*, and the Apostolicall presidency was so contingent and fallible as to depend upon the decree of *Nero*; and if he had sent him to *Antioch* there to have suffered Martyrdome, the Bishop of that Town had been heads of the Catholike Church. And this thing presses the harder, because it is held by no meane persons in the Church of *Rome*, that the Bishoprick of *Rome* and the Papacy are things separable: And the Pope may quit that Sea and sit in another, which to my understanding is an Argument, that he that succeeded *Peter* at *Antioch*, is as much supream by Divine Right as he that sits at *Rome*; both alike, that is, neither by Divine Ordinance: For if the Roman Bishop by

Vid. Camerarium. Qu. vol. 1. c. 1.

Christs

Christ's intention were to be Head of the Chuch, then by the same intention, the Succession must be continued in that Sea, and then let the Pope goe whether he will, the Bishop of *Rome* must be the Head, which they themselves deny, and the Pope himselfe did not believe, when in a schisme he sate at *Avignon*; and that it was to be continued in the Sea of *Rome*, it is but offered to us upon conjecture, upon an act of providence, as they fancy it, so ordering it by vision, and this proved by an Author which themselves call fabulous and Apocryphall, under the name of *Linus*, in *Biblioth. PP. de passione Petri & Pauli*: A goodly building which relies upon an event that was accidentall, whose purpose was but insinuated, the meaning of it but conjectur'd at, and this conjecture so uncertain, that it was an imperfect aime at the purpose of an event, which whether it was true or no, was so uncertain, that it is ten to one there was no such matter. And yet again another degree of uncertainty is, to whom the Bishops of *Rome* doe succeed: For S. *Paul* was as much Bishop of *Rome*, as S. *Peter* was; there he presided, there he preach'd, and he it was that was the Doctor of the Uncircumcision and of the Gentiles, S. *Peter* of the Circumcision, and of the Jewes only; and therefore the converted Jewes at *Rome*, might with better reason claim the privilledge of S. *Peter*, then the Romans and the Churches in her Communion, who doe not derive from Jewish Parents.

7. If the words were never so appropriate to *Peter*, or also communicated to his Successors, yet of what value will the consequent be? what prerogative is entail'd upon the Chaire of *Rome*? For that S. *Peter* was the Ministeriall Head of the Church, is the most that is desir'd to be prov'd by those and all other words brought for the same purposes, and interests of that Sea: Now let the Ministerall Head have what Dignity can be imagined, let him be the first (and in all Communities that are regular, and orderly there must be something that is first, upon certain occasions where an equall power cannot be exercised, and made pompous or ceremoniall:) But will this Ministeriall Headship inferre an infallibility? will it inferre more then the Headship of the Jewish Synagogue, where clearly the High Priest was supreme in many senses, yet in no sense infallible? *Numb.* 9.

infallible? will it inferre more to us, then it did amongſt the Apoſtles? amongſt whom if for orders ſake, S. *Peter* was the firſt, yet he had no compulſory power over the Apoſtles; there was no ſuch thing ſpoke of, nor any ſuch thing put in practiſe. And that the other Apoſtles were by a perſonall priviledge as infallible as himſelfe, is no reaſon to hinder the exerciſe of juriſdiction or any compulſory power over them; for though in Faith they were infallible, yet in manners and matter of fact as likely to erre as S. *Peter* himſelfe was, and certainly there might have ſomething hapned in the whole Colledge, that might have been a Record of his Authority, by tranſmitting an example of the exerciſe of ſome Judiciall power over ſome one of them: If he had but withſtood any of them to their faces as S. *Paul* did him, it had been more then yet is ſaid in his behalfe. Will the Miniſteriall Headſhip inferre any more then when the Church in a Community or a publike capacity, ſhould doe any Act of Miniſtery Eccleſiaſticall, he ſhall be firſt in Order? Suppoſe this to be a dignity to preſide in Councels, which yet was not alwayes granted him; Suppoſe it to be a power of taking cogniſance of the Major Cauſes of Biſhops when Councels cannot be called; Suppoſe it a double voyce or the laſt deciſive, or the negative in the cauſes exteriour; Suppoſe it to be what you will of dignity or externall regiment, which when all Churches were united in Communion, and neither the intereſt of States, nor the engagement of opinions had made diſunion, might better have been acted then now it can; yet this will fall infinitely ſhort of a power to determine Controverſies infallibly, and to preſcribe to all mens faith and conſciences. A Miniſteriall Headſhip or the prime Miniſter cannot in any capacity become the foundation of the Church to any ſuch purpoſe. And therefore men are cauſleſſely amuſed with ſuch premiſes, and are afraid of ſuch Concluſions which will never follow from the admiſſion of any ſenſe of theſe words that can with any probability be pretended.

Numb. 10. 8. I conſider that theſe Arguments from Scripture, are too weak to ſupport ſuch an Authority which pretends to give Oracles, and to anſwer infallibly in Queſtions of Faith, becauſe there is greater reaſon to believe the Popes of *Rome* have erred,

erred, and greater certainty of demonſtration, then theſe places can be that they are infallible, as will appear by the inſtances and perpetuall experiment of their being deceived, of which there is no Queſtion, but of the ſenſe of theſe places there is: And indeed, if I had as clear Scripture for their infallibility, as I have againſt their halfe Communion, againſt their Service in an unknown tongue, worſhipping of Images, and divers other Articles, I would make no ſcruple of believing, but limit and conform my underſtanding to all their Dictates, and believe it reaſonable all Propheeying ſhould be reſtrain'd: But till then, I have leave to diſcourſe, and to uſe my reaſon; And to my reaſon, it ſeemes not likely that neither Chriſt nor any of his Apoſtles, S. *Peter* himſelfe, not S. *Paul* writing to the Church of *Rome*, ſhould ſpeak the leaſt word or tittle of the infallibility of their Biſhops, for it was certainly as convenient to tell us of a remedy, as to foretell that certainly there muſt needs be hereſies, and need of a remedy. And it had been a certain determination of the Queſtion, if when ſo rare an opportunity was miniſtred in the Queſtion about Circumciſion that they ſhould have ſent to *Peter*, who for his infallibility in ordinary, and his power of Headſhip would not only with reaſon enough as being infallibly aſſiſted, but alſo for his Authority have beſt determin'd the Queſtion, if at leaſt the firſt Chriſtians had known ſo profitable and ſo excellent a ſecret; and although we have but little Record, that the firſt Councell at *Jeruſalem* did much obſerve the ſolennities of Law, and the forms of Conciliary proceedings, and the Ceremonials; yet ſo much of it as is recorded, is againſt them, S. *James* and not S. *Peter* gave the finall ſentence, and although S. *Peter* determin'd the Queſtion *pro libertate*, yet S. *James* made the Decree, and the Aſſumentum too, and gave ſentence they ſhould abſtaine from ſome things there mentioned, which by way of temper he judg'd moſt expedient: And ſo it paſſed. And S. *Peter* ſhewed no ſign of a Superiour Authority, nothing of Superiour juriſdiction, Ὅρα ὃ ἀυτὸν μὴ κοινῆς πάντα πεποιῆται μούμης, ἀλλ' ἀυθεντικῶς καὶ ἀρχικῶς. S. Chryſoſt. hom. 3. in. act. Apoſt.

So that if this Queſtion be to be determin'd by Scripture, it muſt either be ended by plaine places or by obſcure; plaine *Numb.* 11.

places there are none, and these that are with greatest fairy pretended, are expounded by Antiquity to contrary purposes. But if obscure places be all the ἀυθεντία, by what meanes shall we infallibly find the sense of them? The Popes interpretation though in all other cases it might be pretended, in this cannot; for it is the thing in Question, and therefore cannot determine for it selfe; either therefore we have also another infallible guide besides the Pope, and so we have two Foundations and two Heads (for this as well as the other upon the same reason) or else (which is indeed the truth) there is no infallible way to be infallibly assured that the Pope is infallible. Now it being against the common condition of men, above the pretences of all other Governours Ecclesiasticall, against the Analogy of Scripture, and the deportment of the other Apostles, against the Oeconomy of the Church, and S. *Peters* own entertainment, the presumption lies against him, and these places, are to be left to their prime intentions and not put upon the rack, to force them to confesse what they never thought.

Numb. 12. But now for Antiquity, if that be deposed in this Question, there are so many circumstances to be considered to reconcile their words and their actions, that the processe is more troublesome, then the Argument can be concluding, or the matter considerable: But I shall a little consider it, so farre at least as to shew either Antiquity said no such thing as is pretended, or if they did, it is but little considerable, because they did not believe themselves; their practise was the greatest evidence in the world against the pretence of their words. But I am much eased of a long disquisition in this particular (for I love not to prove a Question by Arguments whose Authority is in it selfe as fallible, and by circumstances made as uncertain as the Question) by the saying of *Æneas Sylvius*, that before the *Nicene* Councell every man liv'd to himselfe, and small respect was had to the Church of *Rome*, which practise could not well consist with the Doctrine of their Bishops infallibility, and by consequence supreme judgement and last resolution in matters of Faith; but especially by the insinuation and consequent acknowledgement of *Bellarmine*, that for 1000 years together the Fathers knew not of the Doctrine of the Popes infallibility,

De Rom. Pont. l. 4. c. 2. § secunda sententia.

for

for *Nilus*, *Gerſon*, *Alemain*, the Divines of *Paris*, *Alphonſus de Caſtro*, and Pope *Adrian* VI, perſons who liv'd 1400 after Chriſt, affirm, that infallibility is not ſeated in the Popes perſon, that he may erre and ſometimes actually hath, which is a clear demonſtration that the Church knew no ſuch Doctrine as this; there had been no Decree nor Tradition, nor generall opinion of the Fathers, or of any age before them; and therefore this opinion which *Bellarmine* would faine blaſt if he could, yet in his Concluſion he ſayes it is not *propriè hæretica*. A device, and an expreſſion of his own without ſenſe or precedent. But if the Fathers had ſpoken of it and believed it, why may not a diſagreeing perſon as well reject their Authority when it is in behalf of *Rome*, as they of *Rome* without ſcruple caſt them off when they ſpeak againſt it? For as *Bellarmine* being preſſed with the Authority of *Nilus* Biſhop of *Theſſalonica* and other Fathers, he ſayes that the Pope acknowledges no Fathers but they are all his children, and therefore they cannot depoſe againſt him; and if that be true, why ſhall we take their Teſtimonies for him? for if Sonnes depoſe in their Fathers behalfe, it is twenty to one, but the adverſe party will be caſt, and therefore at the beſt it is but *ſuſpectum Teſtimonium*. But indeed this diſcourſe ſignifies nothing, but a perpetuall uncertainty in ſuch topicks, and that where a violent prejudice, or a concerning intereſt is engag'd, men by not regarding what any man ſayes, proclaim to all the world that nothing is certain, but Divine Authority.

But I will not take advantage of what *Bellarmine* ſayes, nor what *Stapleton*, or any one of them all ſay, for that will bee but to preſſe upon perſonall perſwaſions, or to urge a generall Queſtion with a particular defaillance, and the Queſtion is never the nearer to an end; for if *Bellarmine* ſayes any thing that is not to another mans purpoſe or perſwaſion, that man will be tryed by his own Argument, not by anothers: And ſo would every man doe that loves his liberty, as all wiſe men doe, and therefore retain it by open violence, or private evaſions: But to return. *Numb.* 13.

An Authority from *Irenæus* in this Queſtion, and on behalf of the Popes infallibility, or the Authority of the Sea of *Rome*, *Numb.* 14.

or of the necessity of communicating with them is very fallible; for besides that there are almost a dozen answers to the words of the Allegation, as is to be seen in those that trouble themselves in this Question with the Allegation, and answering such Authorities, yet if they should make for the affirmative of this Question, it is *protestatio contra factum.* For *Irenæus* had no such great opinion of Pope *Victors* infallibity, that he believed things in the same degree of necessity that the Pope did, for therefore he chides him for Excommunicating the *Asian* Bishops ἀθρόως all at a blow in the Question concerning Easter day; and in a Question of Faith he expresly disagreed from the doctrine of *Rome*; for *Irenæus* was of the Millenary opinion, and believed it to be a Tradition Apostolicall; now if the Church of *Rome* was of that opinion, then why is she not now? where is the succession of her doctrine? But if she was not of that opinion then, and *Irenæus* was, where was his beliefe of that Churches infallibility? The same I urge concerning S. *Cyprian* who was the head of a Sect in opposition to the Church of *Rome*, in the Question of rebaptization, and he and the abettors, *Firmilian* and the other Bishops of *Cappadocia*, and the voisinage spoke harsh words of *Stephen*, and such as become them not to speak to an infallible Doctor, and the supreme Head of the Church. I will urge none of them to the disadvantage of that Sea, but only note the Satyrs of *Firmilian* against him, because it is of good use, to shew that it is possible for them in their ill carriage to blast the reputation and efficacy of a great Authority: For he sayes that that Church did pretend the Authority of the Apostles, *cum in multis sacramentis divinæ rei, non principio discrepet, & ab Ecclesia Hierosolymitanâ, & defamet Petrum & Paulum tanquam authores.* And a little after *justè dedignor* (sayes he) *apertam & manifestam stultitiam Stephani, per quam veritas Christianæ petræ aboletur*, which words say plainly that for all the goodly pretence of Apostolicall Authority, the Church of *Rome* did then in many things of Religion disagree from Divine Institution (and from the Church of *Jerusalem*, which they had as great esteeme of for Religion sake, as of *Rome* for its principality) and that still in pretending to S. *Peter* and S. *Paul* they dishonoured those blessed Apostles, and destroyed

Epist. Firmiliani contr. Steph. ad Cyprian. Vid. etiam Ep. Cypriani ad Pompeium.

destroyed the honour of their pretence by their untoward prevarication; which words I confesse passe my skill to reconcile them to an opinion of infallibility; and although they were spoken by an angry person, yet they declare that in *Africa* they were not then perswaded, as now they were at *Rome*: *Nam nec Petrus quem primum Dominus elegit vendicavit sibi aliquid insolenter aut arroganter assumpsit, ut diceret se primatum tenere:* That was their belief then, and how the contrary hath grown up to that heigth where now it is all the world is witnesse: And now I shall not need to note concerning S. *Hierome*, that he gave a complement to *Damasus*, that he would not have given to *Liberius*, *Qui tecum non colligit spargit*. For it might be true enough of *Damasus* who was a good Bishop and a right believer; but if *Liberius*'s name had been put instead of *Damasus*, the case had been altered with the name; for S. *Hierom* did believe and write it so, that *Liberius* had subscrib'd to *Arrianism*. And if either he or any of the rest had believ'd the Pope could not be a Heretick nor his Faith faile, but be so good and of so competent Authority as to be a Rule to Christendome; Why did they not appeale to the Pope in the Arrian Controversy? why was the Bishop of *Rome* made a Party and a concurrent as other good Bishops were, and not a Judge and an Arbitrator in the Question? Why did the Fathers prescribe so many Rules and cautions and provisoes for the discovery of heresy? Why were the Emperours at so much charge, and the Church at so much trouble as to call and convene in Councels respectively, to dispute so frequently, to write so sedulously, to observe all advantages against their Adversaries, and for the truth, and never offered to call for the Pope to determine the Question in his Chaire? Certainly no way coud have been so expedite, none so concluding and peremptory, none could have convinc'd so certainly, none could have triumph'd so openly over all discrepants as this, if they had known of any such thing as his being infallible, or that he had been appointed by Christ to be the Judge of Controversies. And therefore I will not trouble this discourse to excuse any more words either pretended or really said to this purpose of the Pope, for they would but make books swell and the Question endlesse,

Cyprian Epist. ad Quintum fratrem.

De Script. Eccl. in Fortunatiano.

endlesse, I shall only to this purpose observe that the Old Writers were so farre from believing the infallibility of the Roman Church or Bishop, that many Bishops and many Churches did actually live and continue out of the Roman Communion; particularly * S. *Austin*, who with 217 Bishops and their Successors for 100 years together stood separate from that Church, if we may believe their own Records: So did *Ignatius* of *Constantinople*, S. *Chrysostome*, S. *Cyprian*, *Firmilian*, those Bishops of *Asia* that separated in the Question of Easter, and those of *Africa* in the Question of rebaptization: But besides this, most of them had opinions which the Church of *Rome* disavowes now, and therefore did so then, or else she hath innovated in her Doctrine, which though it be most true and notorious, I am sure she will never confesse. But no excuse can be made for S. *Austins* disagreeing, and contesting in the Question of appeales to *Rome*, the necessity of Communicating Infants, the absolute damnation of Infants to the paines of Hell, if they die before Baptism, and divers other particulars. It was a famous act of the Bishops of *Liguria* and *Istria* who seeing the Pope of *Rome* consenting to the fifth Synod in disparagement of the famous Councell of *Chalcedon*, which for their own interests they did not like of, they renounced subjection to his Patriarchate, and erected a Patriarch at *Aquileia* who was afterwards translated to *Venice*, where his name remaines to this day. It is also notorious that most of the Fathers were of opinion that the soules of the faithfull did not enjoy the beatifick Vision before Doomesday; whether *Rome* was then of that opinion or no, I know not, I am sure now they are not; witnesse the Councels of *Florence* and *Trent*; but of this I shall give a more full account afterwards. But if to all this which is already noted, we adde that great variety of opinions amongst the Fathers and Councels in assignation of the Canon, they not consulting with the Bishop of *Rome*, nor any of them thinking themselves bound to follow his Rule in enumeration of the books of Scripture, I think no more need to be said as to this particular.

* Vbi illa Augustini & reliquorum prudentia? quis jam ferat crassissimæ ignorantiæ illam vocem in tot & tantis Patribus? *Alan. Cop. dialog. p. 76, 77. Vide etiam Bonifac. II. Epist. ad Eulalium Alexandrinum. Lindanum Panopl. l. 4. c. 89. in fine. Salmeron Tom. 12. Tract. 68. § ad Canonem Sander. de visibili Monarchia, l. 7. n. 411. Baron. Tom. 10. A. D. 878.*

Numb. 15. 8. But now if after all this, there be some Popes which were notorious Hereticks, and Preachers of false Doctrine, some that made

made impious Decrees both in faith and manners; ſome that have determin'd Queſtions with egregious ignorance and ſtupidity, ſome with apparent Sophiſtry, and many to ſerve their own ends moſt openly, I ſuppoſe then the infallibility will diſband, and we may doe to him as to other good Biſhops, believe him when there is cauſe; but if there be none, then to uſe our Conſciences, *Non enim ſalvat Chriſtianum quod Pontifex conſtanter affirmat præceptum ſuum eſſe juſtum, ſed oportet illud examinari, & ſe juxta regulam ſuperius datum dirigere:* I would not inſtance and repeat the errours of dead Biſhops, if the extreme boldneſſe of the pretence did not make it neceſſary: But if we may believe *Tertullian*, Pope *Zepherinus* approv'd the Prophecies of *Montanus*, and upon that approbation granted peace to the Churches of *Aſia* and *Phrygia*, till *Praxeas* perſwaded him to revoke his act: But let this reſt upon the credit of *Tertullian*, whether *Zepherinus* were a *Montaniſt* or no; ſome ſuch thing there was for certain. Pope *Vigilius* denyed two natures in Chriſt, and in his Epiſtle to *Theodora* the Empreſſe anathematiz'd all them that ſaid he had two natures in one perſon; S. *Gregory* himſelfe permitted Prieſts to give confirmation, which is all one as if he ſhould permit Deacons to conſecrate, they being by Divine Ordinance annext to the higher orders; and upon this very ground *Adrianus* affirms that the Pope may erre in *definiendis dogmatibus fidei*. And that we may not feare we ſhall want inſtances, we may to ſecure it take their own confeſſion, *Nam multæ ſunt decretales hæreticæ* ſayes *Occham* as he is cited by *Almain*, *& firmiter hoc credo* (ſayes he for his own particular) *ſed non licet dogmatizare oppoſitum quoniam ſunt determinatæ*. So that we may as well ſee that it is certain that Popes may be Hereticks, as that it is dangerous to ſay ſo; and therefore there are ſo few that teach it: All the Patriarchs and the Biſhop of *Rome* himſelfe ſubſcrib'd to *Arrianiſm* (as *Baronius* confeſſes;) and * *Gratian* affirms that Pope *Anaſtaſius* the Second was ſtrucken of God for communicating with the Heretick *Photinus*. I know it will be made light of that *Gregory* the Seventh ſaith, the very exorciſts of the Roman Church are Superiour to Princes. But what ſhall we think of that decretall of *Gregory* the Third, who wrote

Tract. de interdict. Compoſ. à Theol. Venet. prop. 13.

Lib. adver. Praxeam.

Vid. Liberal. in breviario, cap. 22. Durand. 4. diſt. 7. q. 1.

Quæ. de confirm. art. ult.

3. diſt. 24. q. unica.

A.D. 357. n. 44.

* Diſt. 19. c. 9.

L. 4. Ep. 2.

to

to *Bonaface* his Legate in *Germany*, *quod illi quorum uxores infirmitate aliquâ morbidâ debitum reddere noluerunt, aliis poterant nubere?* was this a Doctrine fit for the Head of the Church, an infallible Doctor? it was plainly, if any thing ever was *doctrina Damoniorum*, and is noted for ſuch by *Gratian*, *cauſ.* 32. *q.* 7. *can. quod propoſuiſti.* Where the gloſſe alſo intimates that the ſame priviledge was granted to the Engliſhmen by *Gregory*, *quia novi erant in fide.* And ſometimes we had little reaſon to expect much better; for, not to inſtance in that learned diſcourſe in the * Canon Law *de majoritate & obedientiâ*, where the Popes Supremacy over Kings is proved from the firſt chapter of *Geneſis*, and the Pope is the Sunne, and the Emperour is the Moone, for that was the fancy of one Pope perhaps; though made authentick and doctrinall by him: it was (if it be poſſible) more ridiculous, that Pope *Innocent* the Third urges that the Moſaicall Law was ſtill to be obſerved, and that upon this Argument, *Sanè*, ſaith he, *cum Deuteronomium ſecunda lex interpretetur ex vi vocabuli comprobatur ut quod ibi decernitur in Teſtamento novo debeat obſervari*: Worſe yet; for when there was a corruption crept into the Decree called *Sancta Romana*, where inſtead of theſe words *Sedulii opus heroicis verſibus deſcriptum*, all the old Copies till of late read *hæreticis verſibus deſcriptum*; this very miſtake made many wiſe men, (as *Pierius* ſayes) yea Pope *Adrian* the Sixth no worſe man, believe that all Poetry was hereticall, becauſe (forſooth) Pope *Gelaſius* whoſe Decree that was, although he believ'd *Sedulius* to be a good Catholike, yet as they thought, he concluded his Verſes to be hereticall: But theſe were ignorances; it hath been worſe amongſt ſome others, whoſe errours have been more malitious. Pope *Honorius* was condemned by the ſixth Generall Synod, and his Epiſtles burnt, and in the ſeventh action of the eigth Synod, the Acts of the Romane Councell under *Adrian* the Second are recited, in which it is ſaid that *Honorius* was juſtly Anathematiz'd, becauſe he was convict of hereſy. *Bellarmine* ſayes it is probable that Pope *Adrian* and the Roman Councell were deceived with falſe Copies of the ſixth Synod, and that *Honorius* was no Heretick. To this I ſay, that although the Roman Synod and the

Vid. Carranz. Sum. Concil. fol. 218. Edit. Antwerp.

Cap per venerabilem. qui filii ſint legitimi.

Diſt. 15. apud Gratian.

De Sacerd. hab.

eighth generall Synod, and Pope *Adrian*, altogether are better witneſſes for the thing then *Bellarmines* conjecture is againſt it, yet if we allow his conjecture wee ſhall loſe nothing in the whole, for either the Pope is no infallible Doctor, but may be a Heretick as *Honorius* was, or elſe a Councell is to us no infallible determiner; I ſay, as to us, for if *Adrian* and the whole *Roman* Councell & the eighth Generall were all cozen'd with falſe Copies of the ſixth Synod, which was ſo little a while before them, and whoſe acts were tranſacted & kept in the Theatre and Records of the Catholike Church; he is a bold man that will be confident that he hath true Copies now. So that let which they pleaſe ſtand or fall, let the Pope be a Heretick or the Councels be deceived and palpably abuſed, (for the other, we will diſpute it upon other inſtances and arguments when we ſhall know which part they will chooſe) in the meane time we ſhall get in the generall what we looſe in the particular. This only, this device of ſaying the Copies of the Councels were falſe, was the ſtratagem of *Albertus Pighius* 900 years after the thing was done, of which invention *Pighius* was preſently admoniſhed, blamed, and wiſhed to recant. Pope *Nicholas* explicated the Myſtery of the Sacrament with ſo much ignorance and zeale that in condemning *Berengarius* he taught a worſe impiety. But what need I any more inſtances; it is a confeſſed caſe by *Baronius*, by *Biel*, by *Stella*, *Almain*, *Occham*, and *Canus*, and generally by the beſt Scholars in the Church of *Rome*, that a Pope may be a Heretick, and that ſome of them actually were ſo, and no leſſe then three generall Councels did beleive the ſame thing: *viz.* ſixth, ſeaventh, and eighth, as *Bellarmine* is pleaſed to acknowledge in his fourth book *de Pontifice Romano*. c. 11. *reſp. ad Arg.* 4. And the Canon *ſi Papa, diſt.* 40. affirms it in expreſſe termes, that a Pope is judicable and puniſhable in that caſe. But there is no wound but ſome Emperick or other will pretend to cure it, and there is a cure for this too. For though it be true that if a Pope were a Heretick, the Church might depoſe him, yet no Pope can be a Heretick, not but that the man may, but the Pope cannot, for he is *ipſo facto* no Pope, for he is no Chriſtian; ſo *Bellarmine*: and ſo when you think you have him faſt, he is gone, and nothing of the Pope left; but who ſees

Vid. diatrib. de act. 6. & 7^a. Synod. præfatione ad Lectorem & Dominicum Bannes 22^æ. q. 1. a. 10. dub. 2.

* Picus Mirand. in expoſit. theorem. 4.

L. 2. c. 30. ubi ſupra. §. eſt ergo.

sees not the extream folly of this evasion? For besides that out of feare and caution he grants more then he needs, more then was sought for in the Question, the Pope hath no more privilege then the Abbot of *Cluny*, for he cannot be a Heretick, nor be deposed by a Councell, for if he be *manifestly* a Heretick he is *ipso facto* no Abbot, for he is no Christian; and if the Pope be a Heretick *privately and occultly*, for that he may be accused and judged sayd the Glosse upon the Canon *si Papa dist.* 40. And the Abbot of *Cluny* and one of his meanest Monks can be no more, therefore the case is all one. But this is fitter to make sport with then to interrupt a serious discourse. And therefore although the Canon *Sancta Romana* approves all the Decretals of Popes, yet that very Decretall hath not decreed it firm enough, but that they are so warily receiv'd by them, that when they list they are pleased to dissent from them; And it is evident in the Extravagant of *Sixtus* IV. *Com. De reliquiis*; who appointed a Feast of the immaculate conception, a speciall Office for the day, and Indulgences enough to the observers of it: And yet the *Dominicans* were so farre from believing the Pope to be infallible and his Decree authentick, that they declaim'd against it in their Pulpits so furiously and so long till they were prohibited under paine of Excommunication, to say the Virgin *Mary* was conceived in Originall sin; Now what sollennity can be more required for the Pope to make a Cathedrall determination of an Article? The Article was so concluded, that a Feast was instituted for its celebration, and pain of Excommunication threatned to them which should preach the contrary; Nothing more solemne, nothing more confident and severe: And yet after all this, to shew that whatsoever those people would have us to believe, they'll believe what they list themselves: This thing was not determined *de fide* saith *Victorellus*; Nay, the Author of the Glosse of the Canon Law hath these expresse words, *De festo Conceptionis nihil dicitur quia celebrandum non est, sicut in multis regionibus fit, & maxime in Angliâ, & hæc est ratio, quia in peccatis concepta fuit sicut & cæteri Sancti.* And the Commissaries, of *Sixtus* V. and *Gregory* XIII. did not expunge these words, but left them upon Record, not only against a received and more approved opinion of the Jesuites and *Franciscans*, but also in

* Vide Alphonsi à Castr. l. 1. adv. hæres. c. 4. hæc lemma ridentem asfabrè.

Vid. etiam Innocentium Serm. 2. de conferat. Pontif. act. 7. 8ª. Synodi. & Concil. 5. sub Symmadio. vide Collat. 8. can. 12. ubi PP. judicialem sententiam P. vigilii in causâ trium Capitulorum damnarunt expressè. Extra. comm. Extrav. grave. Tit. X.

De Angelo custod. tol. 59. de consecrat. dist. 3. can. pronunciand gloss. verb. Nativit.

in plain defiance of a Decree made by their viſible head of the Church, who (if ever any thing was decreed by a Pope, with an intent to oblige all Chriſtendome) decreed *. this to that purpoſe.

So that without taking particular notice of it, that egregious ſophiſtry and flattery of the late Writers of the Roman Church is in this inſtance, beſides divers others before mentioned, clearly made invalid. For here the Biſhop of *Rome* not as a private Doctor, but as Pope, not by declaring his own opinion, but with an intent to oblige the Church, gave ſentence in a Queſtion which the *Dominicans* will ſtill account *pro non determinatâ*. And every decretall recorded in the Canon Law if it be falſe in the matter, is juſt ſuch another inſtance: And *Alphonſus à Caſtro* ſayes it to the ſame purpoſe, in the inſtance of *Celeſtine* diſſolving Marriages for hereſy, *Neq; Cæleſtini error talis fuit qui ſoli negligentiæ imputari debeat, ita ut illum erraſſe dicamus velut privatam perſonam & non ut Papam, quoniam hujuſmodi Cæleſtini definitio habetur in antiquis decretalibus in cap. Laudabilem, titulo de converſione infidelium; quam ego ipſe vidi & legi, lib. 1. adv. hæreſ. cap. 4.* And therefore 'tis a moſt intolerable folly to pretend that the Pope cannot erre in his Chaire, though he may erre in his Cloſet, and may maintaine a falſe opinion even to his death: For beſides that, it is ſottiſh to think that either he would not have the world of his own opinion (as all men naturally would) or that if he were ſet in his Chaire, he would determine contrary to himſelfe in his ſtudy (and therefore to repreſent it as poſſible, they are faine to flie to a Miracle for which they have no colour, neither inſtructions, nor inſinuation, nor warrant, nor promiſe; beſides that, it were impious and unreaſonable to depoſe him for hereſy, who may ſo eaſily, even by ſetting himſelfe in his Chaire and reviewing his Theorems, be cured:) it is alſo againſt a very great experience: For beſides the former Allegations it is moſt notorious, that Pope *Alexander* III in a Councell at *Rome* of 300 Archbiſhops and Biſhops *A. D.* 1179. condemn'd *Peter Lombard* of hereſy in a mattet of great concernment, no leſſe then ſomething about the incarnation; from which ſentence he was, after 36 years abiding it, abſolv'd by Pope *Innocent* III,

* *Hâc in perpetuum valiturâ conſtitutione ſtatuimus, &c. De reliquiis, &c.* Extrav. Com. Sixt. 4. cap. 1. *Numb.* 16.

without repentance or dereliction of the opinion: Now if this sentence was not a Cathedrall Dictate, as solemn and great as could be expected, or as is said to be necessary to oblige all Christendome, let the great Hyperaspists of the Roman Church be Judges, who tell us that a particular Councell with the Popes confirmation is made Oecumenicall by adoption, and is infallible and obliges all Christendome; so *Bellarmine*: And therefore he sayes, that it is *temerarium, erroneum, & proximum hæresi*, to deny it, but whether it be or not it is all one, as to my purpose: For it is certain, that in a particular Councell confirm'd by the Pope, if ever; then and there the Pope sate himselfe in his Chaire, and it is as certain that he sate besides the cushion and determined ridiculously and falsly in this case: But this is a device for which there is no Scripture, no Tradition, no one dogmaticall resolute saying of any Father, Greek or Latine, for above 1000 years after Christ: And themselves when they list can acknowledge as much. And therefore *Bellarmine's* saying, I perceive is believ'd by them to be true: That there are many things in the * Decretall Epistles, which make not Articles to be *de fide*. And therefore, *Non est necessariò credendum determinatis per summum Pontificem*, sayes *Almain*: And this serves their turns in every thing they doe not like, and therefore I am resolved it shall serve my turn also for some thing, and that is, that the matter of the Pope's infallibility is so ridiculous and improbable, that they doe not believe it themselves: Some of them clearly practised the contrary, and although Pope *Leo* X hath determined the Pope to be above a Councell, yet the *Sorbon* to this day scorn it at the very heart. And I might urge upon them that scorn that *Almain* truly enough by way of Argument alledges. It is a wonder that they who affirm the Pope cannot erre in judgement, doe not also affirm that he cannot sinne: they are like enough to say so sayes he, if the vitious lives of the Popes did not make a daily confutation of such flattery: Now for my own particular, I am as confident and think it as certain, that Popes are actually deceived in matters of Christian Doctrine, as that they doe prevaricate the lawes of Christian piety: And therefore † *Alphonsus à Castro* calls them *impudentes Papæ assentatores*, that ascribe to him infallibility

L. 2. de. Concil. cap. 5.

De Pontif. Rom. c. 14. § respondeo. In 3. sent. d 24. q. in conl. 6. dub. 6. in fine.

* Proverbialiter olim dictū erat, de Decretalibus, Malè cum rebus humanis actum esse, ex quo decretis alæ accesserunt. *scil.* cum Decretales post decretum Gratiani sub nomine Gregorii noni edebantur.

De Authorit. Eccles. cap. 10. in fine.

† L. 1. ca. 4. adverſ. hæreſ. edit. Paris 1534. In seqq. non expurgantur ista verba, at idem sensus manet.

ty in judgement or interpretation of Scripture.

But if themſelves did believe it heartily, what excuſe is there in the world, for the ſtrange uncharitableneſſe or ſupine negligence of the Popes, that they doe not ſet themſelves in their Chaire and write infallible Commentaries, and determine all Controverſies without errour, and blaſt all hereſies with the word of their mouth, declare what is and what is not *de fide*, that his Diſciples and Confidents may agree upon it; reconcile the *Franciſcans* and *Dominicans*, and expound all Myſteries? for it cannot be imagined but he that was endued with ſo ſupreme power in order to ſo great ends, was alſo fitted with proportionable, that is, extraordinary perſonall abilities, ſucceeding and deriv'd upon the perſons of all the Popes. And then the Doctors of his Church, need not trouble themſelves with ſtudy, nor writing explications of Scripture, but might wholly attend to practicall devotion, and leave all their Scholaſticall wranglings, the diſtinguiſhing opinions of their Orders, and they might have a fine Church, ſomething like Fairy land, or *Lucians* Kingdome in the Moone: But if they ſay they cannot doe this when they liſt, but when they are mov'd to it by the Spirit, then we are never the nearer; for ſo may the Biſhop of *Angoleſme* write infallible Commentaries when the holy Ghoſt moves him to it, for I ſuppoſe his motions are not ineffectuall, but hee will ſufficiently aſſiſt us in performing of what he actually moves us to: But among ſo many hundred Decrees which the Popes of *Rome* have made or confirmed and atteſted (which is all one) I would faine know in how many of them did the holy Ghoſt aſſiſt them? If they know it, let them declare it, that it may be certain which of their Decretals are *de fide*; for as yet none of his own Church knowes: If they doe not know, then neither can we know it from them, and then we are as uncertaine as ever, and beſides, the holy Ghoſt may poſſibly move him, and he by his ignorance of it may neglect ſo profitable a motion, and then his promiſe of infallible aſſiſtance will be to very little purpoſe, becauſe it is with very much fallibility applicable to practiſe: And therefore it is abſolutely uſeleſſe to any man or any Church, becauſe, ſuppoſe it ſettled in *Theſi*, that the Pope is infallible, yet whether he will doe his duty, and *Numb.* 11.

perform those conditions of being assisted which are required of him, or whether he be a secret Simoniack (for if he be, he is *ipso facto*, no Pope) or whether he be a Bishop, or Priest, or a Christian, being all uncertain; every one of these depending upon the intention and power of the Baptizer or Ordainer, which also are fallible, because they depend upon the honesty and power of other men; we cannot be infallibly certain of any Pope that he is infallible, and therefore when our Questions are dermin'd, we are never the nearer, but may hugge our selves in an imaginary truth, the certainty of finding truth out depending upon so many fallible and contingent circumstances. And therefore, the thing, if it were true, being so to no purpose, it is to be presum'd that God never gave a power so impertinently, and from whence no benefit can accrue to the Christian Church, for whose use and benefit, if at all, it must needs have been appointed.

Numb. 18. But I am too long in this impertinency: If I were bound to call any man Master upon earth, and to believe him upon his own affirmative and authority; I would of all men least follow him that pretends he is infallible and cannot prove it. For that he cannot prove it, makes me as uncertaine as ever, and that he pretends to infallibility makes him careless of using such meanes which will morally secure those wise persons, who knowing their own aptnesse to be deceiv'd, use what endeavours they can to secure themselves from errour, and so become the better and more probable guides.

Numb. 19. Well! Thus farre we are come: Although we are secured in fundamentall points from involuntary errour, by the plaine, expresse, and dogmaticall places of Scripture, yet in other things we are not but may be invincibly mistaken, because of the obscurity and difficulty in the controverted parts of Scripture, by reason of the incertainty of the meanes of its Interpretation, since Tradition is of an uncertain reputation, and sometimes evidently false, Councels are contradictory to each other, and therefore certainly are equally deceiv'd many of them, and therefore all may; and then the Popes of *Rome* are very likely to mislead us, but cannot ascertain us of truth in matter of Question; and in this world we believe in part, and prophecy in part,

part, and this imperfection ſhall never be done away till we be tranſlated to a more glorious ſtate; either we muſt throw our chances, and get truth by accident or predeſtination, or elſe we muſt lie ſafe in a mutuall toleration, and private liberty of perſwaſion, unleſſe ſome other Anchor can bee thought upon where wee may faſten our floating Veſſels, and ride ſafely.

SECT. VIII.

Of the diſability of Fathers, or Writers Eccleſiaſticall, to determine our Queſtions, with certainty and Truth.

THere are ſome that think they can determine all Queſtions in the world by two or three ſayings of the Fathers, or by the conſent of ſo many as they will pleaſe to call a concurrent Teſtimony: But this conſideration will ſoon be at an end; for if the Fathers, when they are witneſſes of Tradition doe not alwayes ſpeak truth, as it hapned in the caſe of *Papias* and his numerous Followers for almoſt three Ages together, then is their Teſtimony more improbable when they diſpute or write Commentaries. *Numb.* 1.

2. The Fathers of the firſt Ages ſpake unitedly concerning divers Queſtions of ſecret Theology, and yet were afterwards contradicted by one perſonage of great reputation, whoſe credit had ſo much influence upon the world, as to make the contrary opinion become popular; why then may not we have the ſame liberty, when ſo plain an uncertainty is in their perſwaſions, and ſo great contrariety in their Doctrines? But this is evident in the caſe of abſolute predeſtination, which till S. *Auſtine's* time no man preached, but all taught the contrary, and yet the reputation of this one excellent man altered the ſcene. But if he might diſſent from ſo Generall a Doctrine, why may not we doe ſo too, it being pretended that he is ſo excellent a precedent to be followed, if we have the ſame reaſon? he had no more Authority nor diſpenſation to diſſent, then any Biſhop hath now. And therefore S. *Auſtin* hath dealt ingeniouſly, and *Numb.* 2.

as

as he took this liberty to himself, so he denies it not to others, but indeed forces them to preserve their own liberty: And therefore when S. *Hierom* had a great mind to follow the Fathers in a point that he fancyed, and the best security he had, was, *Patiaris me cum talibus errare*, S. *Austin* would not endure it, but answered his reason, and neglected the Authority. And therefore it had been most unreasonable that we should doe that now, though in his behalfe, which he towards greater persons (for so they were then) at that time judg'd to be unreasonable. It is a plaine recession from Antiquity, which was determin'd by the Councell of *Florence, piorum animas purgatas, &c. mox in Cœlum recipi, & intueri clarè ipsum Deum trinum & unum sicuti est:* As who please to try, may see it dogmatically resolved to the contrary by [a] *Justin Martyr*, [b] *Irenæus*, by [c] *Origen*, [d] S. *Chrysostome*, [e] *Theodoret*, [f] *Arethas Cæsariensis*, [g] *Euthymius*, who may answer for the Greek Church, and it is plaine that it was the opinion of the Greek Church by that great difficulty the Romans had of bringing the Greeks to subscribe to the *Florentine* Councell, where the Latines acted their master-piece of wit and stratagem, the greatest that hath been till the famous and superpolitick design of *Trent*. And for the Latine Church, [h] *Tertullian*, [i] S. *Ambrose*, [k] S. *Austin*, [l] S. *Hilary*, [m] *Prudentius*, [n] *Lactantius*, [o] *Victorinus Martyr*, and [p] S. *Bernard* are known to be of opinion that the soules of the Saints are in *abditis receptaculis, & exterioribus atriis*, where they expect the resurrection of their bodies, and the glorification of their soules, and though they all believe them to be happy, yet they enjoy not the beatifick Vision before the resurrection: Now there being so full a consent of Fathers (for many more may be added) and the Decree of Pope *John* XXII, besides, who was so confident for his Decree that he commanded the University of *Paris* to swear that they would preach it and no other, and that none should be promoted to degrees in Theology, that did not swear the like, (as [q] *Occham*, [r] *Gerson*, [s] *Marsilius* and [t] *Adrianus* report:) Since it is esteemed lawfull to dissent from all these, I hope no man will be so unjust to presse other men to consent to an Authority which he him-

Sess. ult.
[a] Q. 60. ad Christian.
[b] Lib. 5.
[c] Hom. 7 in Levit.
[d] Hom. 39 in 1 Cor.
[e] In c. 11. ad Heb.
[f] In c. 6. ad Apoc.
[g] In 16. c. Luc.
[h] Lib. 4. adv. Mar.
[i] L. 2. de Cain. c. 2.
[k] Ep. III. ad Fortunatianum.
[l] In Psal. 138.
[m] De exeq. defunctor.
[n] L. 7. c. 21.
[o] In c. 6. Apoc.
[p] Serm. 3. de om. sanctis. Vid. enim, S. Aug. in Enchir. c. 108. & l. 12. de civit. Dei. c. 9. & in Ps. 36. & in l. 1. retract. c. 14. Vid. insuper testimonia quæ collegit. Spala. l. 5. c. 8. n. 98. de repub. Eccl. & Sixt. Senens. l. 6. annot. 345.
[q] In oper. 90. dierum.
[r] Serm. de Paschal.
[s] In 4. sent. q. 13. a. 3.
[t] In 4. de Sacram. confirmat.

selfe

selfe judges to be incompetent. These two great instances are enough, but if more were necessary I could instance in the opinion of the *Chiliasts*, maintained by the second and third Centuries and disavowed ever since: in the Doctrine of communicating Infants, taught and practised as necessary by the fourth and fifth Centuries, & detested by the Latine Church in all the following Ages: in the variety of opinions concerning the very form of baptism, some keeping close to the institution and the words of its first sanction, others affirming it to be sufficient, if it be administred *in nomine Christi*; particularly S. *Ambrose*, Pope *Nicholas* the First, † V. *Bede* and † S. *Bernard* besides some Writers of after Ages as *Hugo de S. Victore*, and the Doctors generally his contemporaries. And it would not be inconsiderable to observe, that if any Synod, Generall, Nationall, or Provinciall, be receded from by the Church of the later Age, (as there have been very many) then, so many Fathers as were then assembled and united in opinion are esteemed no Authority to determine our perswasions. Now suppose 200 Fathers assembled in such a Councell, if all they had writ Books, and Authorities, 200 Authorities had beene alleadged in confirmation of an opinion, it would have made a mighty noise, and loaded any man with an insupportable prejudice that should dissent: And yet every opinion maintained against the Authority of any one Councell, though but Provinciall, is in its proportion such a violent recession and neglect of the Authority and doctrine of so many Fathers as were then assembled, who did as much declare their opinion in those Assemblies by their Suffrages, as if they had writ it in so many books; and their opinion is more considerable in the Assembly then in their writings, because it was more deliberate, assisted, united and more dogmaticall. In pursuance of this observation, it is to be noted by way of instance, that S. *Austin* and two hundred and seventeene Bishops and all their Successors * for a whole Age together did consent in denying appeals to *Rome*; and yet the Authority of so many Fathers (all true Catholicks) is of no force now at *Rome* in this Question; but if it be in a matter they like, one of these Fa-

De consecrat. dist. 4. c. à quodam Iudæo

* In c. 10. Act.

† Ep. 340.

* Vid. Epist. Bonifacii II. apud Nicolinum, Tom. 2. Concil. pag. 544. & exemplar precum Eulalii apud eundem. ibid. p. 525. Qui anathematizat omnes decisores suos qui in in ea causa Romæ se opponendo rectæ fidei regulam

prævaricati sunt, inter quos tamen fuit Augustinus, quem pro maledicto Cælestinus tacite agnoscit, admittendo *sc.* exemplar precum. *Vid. Doctor. Marta. de jurisdict. part.* 4. p. 273. & *Erasm. annot. in Hieron. præfat. in Daniel.*

thers alone is sufficient. The Doctrine of S. *Austin* alone brought in the festivall and veneration of the assumption of the blessed Virgin, and the hard sentence passed at *Rome* upon unbaptized Infants and the *Dominican* opinion concerning predetermination, derived from him alone as from their Originall: so that if a Father speaks for them, it is wonderfull to see what Tragedies are stirred up against them that dissent, as is to be seen in that excellent nothing of *Campian's* ten reasons. But if the Fathers be against them, then *Patres in quibusdam non leviter lapsi sunt* sayes *Berllarmine*, and *constat quosdam ex præcipuis*, it is certain the chiefest of them have fouly erred. Nay, *Posa*, *Salmeron*, and *Wadding* in the Question of the immaculate conception make no scruple to dissent from Antiquity; to prefer new Doctors before the Old, and to justifie themselves, bring instances in which the Church of *Rome* had determin'd against the Fathers. And it is not excuse enough to say that singly the Fathers may erre, but if they concurre they are certain Testimony. For there is no question this day disputed by persons that are willing to be tryed by the Fathers, so generally attested on either side, as some points are which both sides dislike severally or conjunctly. And therefore tis not honest for either side to presse the Authority of the Fathers, as a concluding Argument in matter of dispute, unlesse themselves will bee content to submit in all things to the Testimony of an equall number of them, which I am certain neither side will doe.

De verb. Dei l. 3. c. 10. §. dicesi.

Numb. 3. 3. If I should reckon all the particular reasons against the certainty of this topick, it would be more then needs as to this Question, and therefore I will abstaine from all disparagement of those worthy Personages, who were excellent lights to their severall Dioceses, and Cures. And therefore I will not instance that *Clemens Alexandrinus* taught that Christ felt no hunger or thirst, but eat only to make demonstration of the verity of his humane nature: Nor that S. *Hilary* taught that Christ in his sufferings had no sorrow; nor that *Origen* taught the paines of Hell not to have an eternall duration: Nor that S. *Cyprian* taught rebaptization; nor that *Athenagoras* condemned second marriages; nor that S. *John Damascen* said, Christ only prayed in appearance, not really and in truth; I will let them all rest

Strom. l. 3. & 6.

in

in peace, and their memories in honour; for if I ſhould enquire into the particular probations of this Article, I muſt doe to them as I ſhould be forced to doe now; if any man ſhould ſay that the Writings of the School-men were excellent Argument and Authority to determine mens perſwaſions; I muſt conſider their writings, and obſerve their defaillances, their contradictions, the weakneſſe of their Arguments, the miſ-allegations of Scripture, their inconſequent deductions, their falſe opinions, and all the weakneſſes of humanity, and the failings of their perſons, which no good man is willing to doe, unleſſe he be compel'd to it by a pretence that they are infallible, or that they are followed by men even into errors or impiety. And therefore ſince there is enough in the former inſtances, to cure any ſuch miſperſwaſion and prejudice, I will not inſtance in the innumerable particularities that might perſwade us to keep our Liberty intire or to uſe it diſcreetly. For it is not to be denyed but that great advantages are to be made by their writings, *& probabile eſt quod omnibus, quod pluribus, quod ſapientibus videtur*; If one wiſe man ſayes a thing, it is an Argument to me to believe it in its degree of probation, that is, proportionable to ſuch an aſſent as the Authority of a wiſe man can produce, and when there is nothing againſt it that is greater; and ſo in proportion higher and higher as more wiſe men (ſuch as the old Doctors were) doe affirm it. But that which I complain of is that we look upon wiſe men that lived long agoe with ſo much veneration and miſtake, that we reverence them not for having been wiſe men, but that they lived long ſince. But when the Queſtion is concerning Authorty, there muſt bee ſomething to build it on; a Divine Commandment, humane Sanction, excellency of ſpirit, and greatneſſe of underſtanding, on which things all humane Authority is regularly built. But now if we had lived in their times (for ſo we muſt look upon them now, as they did who without prejudice beheld them) I ſuppoſe we ſhould then have beheld them, as we in *England* look on thoſe Prelates, who are of great reputation for learning and ſanctity; here only is the difference; when perſons are living, their authority is depreſſed by their perſonall defaillances, and the contrary intereſts of their contemporaries,

which diſband when they are dead, and leave their credit intire upon the reputation of thoſe excellent books, and monuments of learning and piety which are left behind: But beyond this why the Biſhop of *Hippo* ſhall have greater Authority then the Biſhop of the *Canaries*, *cæteris paribus*, I underſtand not. For did they that liv'd (to inſtance) in S. *Auſtine's* time believe all that he wrote? If they did, they were much too blame, or elſe himſelfe was too blame for retracting much of it a little before his death; And if while he lived, his affirmative was no more Authority, then derives from the credit of one very wiſe man, againſt whom alſo very wiſe men were oppoſed; I know not why his Authority ſhould prevaile further now; For there is nothing added to the ſtrength of his reaſon, ſince that time, but only that he hath been in great eſteem with poſterity: And if that be all, why the opinion of the following Ages, ſhall be of more force then the opinion of the firſt Ages, againſt whom S. *Auſtin* in many things clearly did oppoſe himſelfe, I ſee no reaſon; or whether the firſt Ages were againſt him or no, yet that he is approved by the following Ages is no better Argument; for it makes his Authority not to be innate, but derived from the opinion of others, and ſo to be *precaria*, and to depend upon others, who if they ſhould change their opinions, and ſuch examples there have been many, then there were nothing left to urge our conſent to him; which when it was at the beſt, was only this, becauſe he had the good Fortune to be believed by them that came after, he muſt be ſo ſtill; and becauſe it was no Argument for the old Doctors before him, this will not be very good in his behalfe: The ſame I ſay of any company of them, I ſay not ſo of all of them, it is to no purpoſe to ſay it, for there is no Queſtion this day in conteſtation, in the explication of which all the old Writers did conſent: In the aſſignation of the Canon of Scripture, they never did conſent for ſix hundred yeares together, and then by that time the Biſhops had agreed indifferently well, and but indifferently, upon that, they fell out in twenty more; and except it be in the Apoſtels Creed, and Articles of ſuch nature, there is nothing which may with any colour be called a conſent, much leſſe Tradition Univerſall.

4. But

4. But I will rather chuſe to ſhew the uncertainty of this Topick by ſuch an Argument, which was not in the Fathers power to help, ſuch as makes no invaſion upon their great reputation, which I deſire ſhould be preſerved as ſacred as it ought. For other things, let who pleaſe read Mr *Daille du vray uſage des Peres*; But I ſhall only conſider that the Writings of the Fathers have been ſo corrupted by the intermixture of Heretick's, ſo many falſe books put forth in their names, ſo many of their Writings loſt which would more clearly have explicated their ſenſe, and at laſt an open profeſſion made, and a trade of making the Fathers ſpeak, not what themſelves thought, but what other men pleaſed, that it is a great inſtance of God's providence and care of his Church, that we have ſo much good preſerved in the Writings which we receive from the Fathers, and that all truth is not as clear gone, as is the certainty of their great Authority and reputation. *Numb.* 4.

The publiſhing books with the inſcription of great names began in S. *Paul's* time; for ſome had troubled the Church of *Theſſalonica* with a falſe Epiſtle in S. *Paul's* name; againſt the inconvenience of which he arms them in 2 *Theſſ.* 2. 1. And this increaſed daily in the Church. The *Arrians* wrot an Epiſtle to *Conſtantine*, under the name of *Athanaſius*, and the *Eutychians* wrot againſt *Cyrill* of *Alexandria* under the name of *Theodoret*; and of the Age in which the ſeventh Synod was kept; *Eraſmus* reports, *Libris falſo celebrium virorum titulo commendatis ſcatere omnia.* It was then a publike buſineſſe, and a trick not more baſe then publick: But it was more ancient then ſo, and it is memorable in the books attributed to S. *Baſil*, containing thirty Chapters *de Spiritu Sancto*, whereof fifteen were plainly added by another hand under the covert of S. *Baſil*, as appears in the difference of the ſtile, in the impertinent digreſſions, againſt the cuſtome of that excellent man, by ſome paſſages contradictory to others of S. *Baſil*, by citing *Meletius* as dead before him, who yet lived three * years after him, and by the very frame and manner of the diſcourſe; and yet it was ſo handſomly carried, and ſo well ſerv'd the purpoſes of men, that it was quoted under the title of S. *Baſil* by many, but without naming the number of chapters, and by S. *John Damaſcen* in *Numb.* 5. Apolog. Athanaſ. ad Conſtant. Vid. Baron. *A.D.* 553. * Vid. Baron. in Annal.

these words, *Basilius in opere triginta capitum de Spiritu S. ad Amphilochium*, and to the same purpose, and in the number of 27 & 29. chapters he is is cited by *Photius, by Euthymius, by Burchard, by Zonaras, Balsamon* and *Nicephorus*; but for this see more in *Erasmus's* his Preface upon this book of S. *Basil.* There is an Epistle goes still under the name of S. *Hierom ad Demetriadem vi ginem*, and is of great use in the Question of Predestination, with its appendices, and yet a very † learned man 800 yeares agone did believe it to be written by a *Pelagian*, and undertakes to confute divers parts of it, as being high and confident *Pelagianisme*, and written by *Julianus Episc. Eclanensis*, but *Gregorius Ariminensis* from S. *Austin* affirmes it to have been written by *Pelagius* himselfe. I might instance in too many. There is not any one of the Fathers who is esteemed Author of any considerable number of books, that hath escaped untouched; But the abuse in this kinde hath been so evident that now if any interessed person of any side be pressed with an Authority very pregnant against him, he thinks to escape by accusing the Edition, or the Author, or the hands it passed through, or at last he therefore suspects it, because it makes against him; both sides being resolv'd that they are in the right, the Authorities that they admit, they will believe not to be against them; and they which are too plainly against them, shall be no Authorities: And indeed the whole world hath been so much abused that every man thinks he hath reason to suspect whatsoever is against him, that is, what he please; which prooceeding only produces this truth, that there neither is nor can be any certainty, nor very much probability in such Allegations.

L. 1. de imagin. orat. 1.

* Nomocan. tit. 1. cap. 3.

† V. Beda. de gratiâ Christi adv. Iulian. m.

Greg. Arim. in 2. sent. dist. 26. q. 1. a. 3.

Numb. 6. But there is a worse mischiefe then this, besides those very many which are not yet discovered, which like the pestilence destroyes in the dark, and growes into inconvenience more insensibly and more irremediably, and that is, corruption of particular places, by inserting words and altering them to contrary senses: A thing which the Fathers of the sixth Generall Synod complain'd of concerning the constitutions of S. *Clement, quibus jam olim ab iis qui à fide aliena sentiunt adulterina quædam etiam pietate aliena introducta sunt quæ divinorum nobis Decretorum*

Can. 2.

elegantem

elegantem & venustam speciem obscurarunt : And so also have his Recognitions, so have his Epistles been used, if at least they were his at all, particularly the fifth Decretall Epistle that goes under the name of S. *Clement*, in which community of Wives is taught upon the Authority of S. *Luke* saying the first Christians had all things common; if all things, then Wives also sayes the Epistle; a forgery like to have been done by some *Nicolaitan*, or other impure person : There is an Epistle of *Cyrill* extant to *Successus* Bishop of *Diocæsarea*, in which he relates that hee was ask'd by *Budus* Bishop of *Emessa*, whether he did approve of the Epistle of *Athanasius* to *Epictetus* Bishop of *Corinth*, and that his answer was, *Si hæc apud vos scripta non sint adultera: Nam plura ex his ab hostibus Ecclesiæ deprehenduntur esse depravata:* And this was done even while the Authors themselves were alive; for so *Dionysius* of *Corinth* complan'd that his writings were corrupted by Hereticks, and Pope *Leo*, that his Epistle to *Flavianus* was perverted by the Greeks: And in the Synod of *Constantinople* before quoted (the sixth Synod) *Macarius* and his Disciples were convicted *quod Sanctorum testimonia aut truncârint aut depravârint*: Thus the third Chapter of S. *Cyprians* book *de unitate Ecclesiæ* in the Edition of *Pamelius* suffered great alteration: These words [*Primatus Petro datur*] wholly inserted, and these [*super Cathedram Petri fundata est Ecclesia*] and whereas it was before, *super unum ædificat Ecclesiam Christus*, that not being enough they have made it *super* [*illum*] *unum*. Now these Additions are against the faith of all old Copies, before *Minutius* and *Pamelius*, and against *Gratian*, even after himselfe had been chastiz'd by the Roman Correctors, the Commissaries of *Gregory* XIII, as is to be seen where these words are alledged, *Decret. c.* 24. *Q.* 1. *can. loquitur Dominus ad Petrum.* So that we may say of *Cyprians* works as *Pamelius* himself said concerning his writings and the writings of other of the Fathers, *unde colligimus* (saith he) *Cypriani scripta ut & aliorum Veterum à librariis variè fuisse interpolata.* But *Gratian* himselfe could doe as fine a feat when he listed, or else some body did it for him, and it was in this very Question, their beloved Article of the Popes Supremacy; for *de panit. dist.* 1. *c. potest fieri.* he quotes these words out of

Euseb. l. 4. c. 23.

Act. 8. vid. etiam. Synod 7. act. 1.

Annot. Cyprian. super. Concil. Carthag. n. 1.

of S. *Ambrose*, *Non habent Petri hæreditatem qui non habent Petri sedem; fidem*, not *sedem*, it is in S. *Ambrose*; but this errour was made authentick by being inserted into the Code of the Law of the Catholick Church; and considering how little notice the Clergy had of Antiquity, but what was transmitted to them by *Gratian*, it will be no great wonder that all this part of the world swallowed such a bole and the opinion that was wrapped in it. But I need not instance in *Gratian* any further, but refer any one that desires to be satisfied concerning this Collection of his, to *Augustinus* Archbishop of *Tarracon in emendatione Gratiani*, where he shall find fopperies and corruptions good store noted by that learned man: But that the *Iudices Expurgatorii* commanded by Authority, and practised with publike license professe to alter and correct the sayings of the Fathers, and to reconcile them to the Catholike sense by putting in and leaving out, is so great an Imposture, so unchristian a proceeding, that it hath made the faith of all books and all Authors justly to be suspected; For considering their infinite diligence and great opportunity, as having had most of the Copies in their own hands, together with an unsatisfiable desire of prevailing in their right or in their wrong, they have made an absolute destruction of this Topick, and when the Fathers speak * Latine, or breathe in a Roman Dioceſe, although the providence of God does infinitely over-rule them, and that it is next to a miracle that in the Monuments of Antiquity, there is no more found that can pretend for their advantage then there is, which indeed is infinitely inconsiderable: Yet our Questions and uncertainties are infinitely multiplyed in stead of a probable and reasonable determination. For since the Latines alwayes complain'd of the Greeks for privately corrupting the Ancient Records both of Councels and † Fathers, and now the Latines make open profession not of corrupting, but of correcting their writings (that's the word) and at the most it was but a humane authority, and that of persons not alwayes learned, and very often deceiv'd; the whole matter is so unreasonable, that it is not worth a further disquisition. But if any one desires to enquire further, he may be satisfied in *Erasmus*, in *Henry* and *Robert Stephens*, in their Prefaces before

Vid. Ind. Expurg. Belg. in Bertram. & Flandr. Hispan. Portugal. Neopolitan. Romanum. Iunium in præfat. ad Ind. Expurg. Belg. Hasenmullerum, pag. 275. Withrington. Apolog. num. 449.

* Videat Lector Andream Cristovium in Bello Iesuitico, & Ioh. Reinolds in libr. de idol. Rom.

† Vid. Ep. Nicolai ad Michael. Imperat.

before the Editions of Fathers, and their Obſervations upon them: in *Bellarmine de ſcript. Eccleſ.* in Dr. *Reynolds, de libris Apocryphis,* in *Scaliger,* and *Robert Coke* of *Leedes* in *Yorkeſhire,* in his Book *De cenſura Patrum.*

SECT. IX.

Of the incompetency of the Church in its diffuſive capacity to be judge of Controverſies, and the impertinency of that pretence of the Spirit.

AND now after all theſe conſiderations of the ſeverall Topicks, Tradition, Councels, Popes and ancient Doctors of the Church, I ſuppoſe it will not be neceſsary, to conſider the authority of the Church apart. For the Church either ſpeaks by Tradition, or by a repreſentative body in a Councel, by Popes, or by the Fathers: for the Church is not a *Chimæra,* not a ſhadow, but a company of men beleeving in Jeſus Chriſt, which men either ſpeak by themſelves immediately, or by their Rulers, or by their proxies and repreſentatives; now I have conſidered it in all ſenſes but in its diffuſive capacity; in which capacity ſhe cannot be ſuppoſed to be a Judge of Controverſies, both becauſe in that capacity ſhe cannot teach us, as alſo becauſe if by a Judge we mean all the Church diffuſed in all its parts and members, ſo there can be no controverſie, for if all men be of that opinion, then there is no queſtion conteſted; if they be not all of a mind, how can the whole diffuſive Catholike Church be pretended in defiance of any one article, where the diffuſive Church being divided, part goes this way, and part another? But if it be ſaid, the greateſt part muſt carry it; Beſides that it is impoſſible for us to know which way the greateſt part goes in many queſtions, it is not alwaies true that the greater part is the beſt, ſometimes the contrary is moſt certain, and it is often very probable, but it is alwayes poſſible. And when paucity of followers was objected to *Liberius,* he gave this in anſwer, There was a time when but three Children of the Captivity reſiſted the Kings Decree. And *Athanaſius* wrote on purpoſe againſt thoſe that did judge of truth by multitudes, and indeed it concerned him ſo to doe, when he alone ſtood in the gap againſt the numerous armies of the Arrians. *Numb.* 1. Theod. l. 2. c. 16. hiſt. Tom. 2.

Numb. 2. But if there could in this case be any distinct consideration of the Church, yet to know which is the true Church is so hard to be found out, that the greatest questions of Christendome are judged before you can get to your Judge, and then there is no need of him. For those questions which are concerning the Judge of questions must be determined before you can submit to his judgement, and if you can your selves determine those great questions which consist much in universalities, then also you may determine the particulars as being of less difficulty. And he that considers how many notes there are given to know the true Church, no less then 15. by *Bellarmine*, and concerning every one of them almost whether it be a certaine note or no there are very many questions and uncertainties, and when it is resolved which are the notes, there is more dispute about the application of these notes then of the προκειμενον, will quickly be satisfied that he had better sit still then to goe round about a difficult and troublesome passage, and at last get no further, but returne to the place from whence he first set out. And there is one note amongst the rest, Holiness of Doctrine, that is, so as to have nothing false either in *Doctrina fidei or morum*, (for so *Bellarmine* explicates it) which supposes all your Controversies, judged before they can be tryed by the authority of the Church, and when we have found out all true Doctrine (for that is necessary to judge of the Church by, that as Saint *Austin's* councell is *Ecclesiam in verbis Christi investigemus*) then we are bound to follow because we judge it true, not because the Church hath said it, and this is to judge of the Church by her Doctrine, not of the Doctrine by the Church. And indeed it is the best and only way; But then how to judge of that Doctrine will be afterwards inquired into. In the meane time, the Church, that is, the Governours of the Churches are to judge for themselves, & for all those who cannot judge for themselves. For others, they must know that their Governours judge for them too, so as to keepe them in peace and obedience, though not for the determination of their private perswasions. For the Oeconomy of the Church requires that her authority be received by all her children. Now this authority is divine in its originall, for it derives immediately from Christ, but it is humane in its ministration. We are to be lead like men not like beasts; A rule is re-

prescribed for the guides themselves to follow, as we are to follow the guides; and although in matters indeterminable or ambiguous the presumption lyes on behalfe of the Governours, (for we do nothing for authority if we suffer it not to weigh that part down of an indifferency and a question which she chooses) yet if there be *error manifestus*, as it often happens, or if the Church-Governours themselves be rent into innumerable sects, as it is this day in Christendome, then we are to be as wise as we can in chooſing our guides, and then to follow so long as that reason remains for which we first chose them. And even in that Government which was an immediate sanction of God, I mean the Ecclesiasticall government of the Synagogue, where God had consign'd the High-Priests authority with a menace of death to them that should disobey, that all the world might know the meaning and extent of such precepts, and that there is a limit beyond which they cannot command, and we ought not to obey: it came once to that pass, that if the Priest had been obeyed in his Conciliary decrees, the whole Nation had been bound to beleeve the condemnation of our blessed Saviour to have been just, and at another time the Apostles must no more have preached in the name of JESUS. But here was manifest error. And the case is the same to every man that invincibly and therefore innocently beleeves it so. *Deo potius quàm hominibus* is our rule in such cases. For although every man is bound to follow his guide, unless he beleeves his guide to mislead him; yet when he sees reason against his guide, it is best to follow his reason: for though in this he may fall into error, yet he will escape the sin; he may doe violence to truth, but never to his own conscience; and an honest error is better then an hypocriticall profession of truth, or a violent luxation of the understanding, since if he retains his honesty and simplicity, he cannot erre in a matter of faith or absolute necessity: Gods goodness hath secur'd all honest and carefull persons from that; for other things, he must follow the best guides he can, and he cannot be obliged to follow better then God hath given him.

And there is yet another way pretended of infallible Expositions of Scripture; and that is, by the Spirit. But of this I shall say no more, but that it is impertinent as to this question. *Numb.* 3.

For put case the Spirit is given to some men enabling them to expound infallibly, yet because this is but a private assistance, and cannot be proved to others, this infallible assistance may determine my own assent, but shall not inable me to prescribe to others, because it were unreasonable I should, unless I could prove to him that I have the Spirit, and so can secure him from being deceived, if he relyes upon me. In this case I may say as S. *Paul* in the case of praying with the Spirit, *He verily giveth thanks well, but the other is not edified.* So that let this pretence be as true as it will, it is sufficient that it cannot be of consideration in this question.

Numb. 4. The result of all is this; Since it is not reasonable to limit and prescribe to all mens understandings by any externall rule in the interpretation of difficult places of Scripture which is our rule: Since no man nor company of men is secure from error, or can secure us that they are free from malice, interest and design; and since all the wayes by which we usually are taught, as Tradition, Councels, Decretals, &c. are very uncertain in the matter, in their authority, in their being legitimate and naturall, and many of them certainly false, and nothing certain but the divine authority of Scripture, in which all that is necessary is plain, and much of that that is not necessary is very obscure, intricate and involved, either we must set up our rest, onely upon articles of faith, and plain places, and be incurious of other obscurer revelations, (which is a duty for persons of private understandings, and of no publike function) or if we will search further (to which in some measure the guides of others are obliged) it remains we inquire how men may determine themselves, so as to doe their duty to God, and not to disserve the Church, that every such man may doe what he is bound to, in his personall capacity, and as he relates to the publike as a publike minister.

SECT.

SECT. X.

Of the authority of Reaſon, and that it proceeding upon beſt grounds is the beſt judge,

HEre then I conſider, that although no man may be truſted to judge for all others, unleſs this perſon were infallible and authorized ſo to doe, which no man nor no company of men is, yet every man may be truſted to judge for himſelf, I ſay every man that can judge at all, (as for others they are to be ſaved as it pleaſeth God) but others that can judge at all muſt either chooſe their guides who ſhall judge for them, (and then they oftentimes doe the wiſeſt, and alwayes ſave themſelves a labour, but then they chooſe too) or if they be perſons of greater underſtanding, then they are to chooſe for themſelves in particular, what the others doe in generall, and by chooſing their guide; and for this any man may be better truſted for himſelfe then any man can be for another: For in this caſe his own intereſt is moſt concerned; and ability is not ſo neceſsary as honeſty, which certainly every man will beſt preſerve in his owne caſe, and to himſelfe, (and if he does not, it is he that muſt ſmart for't) and it is not required of us not to be in errour, but that we endeavour to avoid it. *Numb.* 1.

2. He that followes his guide ſo far as his reaſon goes along with him, or which is all one, he that followes his owne reaſon (not guided onely by naturall arguments, but by divine revelation, and all other good meanes) hath great advantages over him that gives himſelfe wholly to follow any humane guide whatſoever, becauſe he followes all their reaſons and his own too; he follows them till reaſon leaves them, or till it ſeemes ſo to him, which is all one to his particular, for by the confeſſion of all ſides, an erroneous Conſcience binds him, when a right guide does not bind him. But he that gives himſelfe up wholly to a guide is oftentimes (I meane, if he be a diſcerning perſon) forc'd to doe violence to his own underſtanding, and to loſe all the benefit of his owne diſcretion, that he may reconcile his reaſon to his guide. And of this we ſee infinite inconveniences in the Church of *Rome*, *Numb.* 2.

for we finde persons of great understanding, oftentimes so amused with the authority of their Church, that it is pity to see them sweat in answering some objections, which they know not how to doe, but yet beleeve they must, because the Church hath said it. So that if they reade, study, pray, search records, and use all the means of art and industry in the pursuite of truth, it is not with a resolution to follow that which shall seem truth to them, but to confirm what before they did beleeve: and if any argument shall seeme unanswerable against any Article of their Church, they are to take it for a temptation, not for an illumination, and they are to use it accordingly: which makes them make the Devill to be the Author of that which Gods Spirit hath assisted them to find in the use of lawfull means and the search of truth. And when the Devill of falshood is like to be cast out by Gods Spirit, they say that it is through *Beelzebub*; which was one of the worst things that ever the Pharisees said or did: And was it not a plain stifling of the just and reasonable demands made by the Emperour, by the Kings of *France* and *Spaine*, and by the ablest Divines among them which was used in the Councell of *Trent*, when they demanded the restitution of Priests to their liberty of marriage, the use of the Chalice, the Service in the vulgar Tongue, and these things not onely in pursuance of Truth, but for other great and good ends, even to take away an infinite scandall and a great schisme? And yet when they themselves did profess it, and all the world knew these reasonable demands were denyed meerly upon a politick consideration, yet that these things should be fram'd into articles, and decrees of faith, and they for ever after bound not onely not to desire the same things, but to think the contrary to be divine truths: never was Reason made more a slave or more useless. Must not all the world say, either they must be great hypocrites, or doe great violence to their understanding, when they not onely cease from their claim, but must also beleeve it to be unjust? If the use of their reason had not been restrained by the tyrannie & imperiousnes of their guide, what the Emperour, and the Kings, and their Theologues would have done, they can best judge who consider the reasonablenes of the demand, and the unreasonablenes of the denyal. But we see many wise men who with their *Optandum esset ut Ecclesia*

cleſia licentiam daret, &c. proclaime to all the world, that in ſome things they conſent and doe not conſent, and doe not heartily beleeve what they are bound publickly to profeſs, and they themſelves would cleerly ſee a difference, if a contrary decree ſhould be fram'd by the Church, they would with an infinite greater confidence reſt themſelves in other propoſitions then what they muſt beleeve as the caſe now ſtands, and they would find that the authority of a Church is a prejudice as often as a free and modeſt uſe of reaſon is a temptation.

3. God will have no man preſsed with anothers inconveniences in matters ſpirituall and intellectuall, no mans ſalvation to depend upon another, and every tooth that eats ſowre grapes ſhall be ſet on edge for it ſelfe, and for none elſe: and this is remarkable in that ſaying of God by the Prophet, *If the Prophet ceaſes to tell my people of their ſins, and leads them into error, the people ſhall die in their ſins, and the blood of them I will require at the hands of that Prophet:* Meaning, that God hath ſo ſet the Prophets to guide us, that we alſo are to follow them by a voluntary aſsent by an act of choice and election. For although accidentally and occaſionally the ſheep may periſh by the ſhepherds fault, yet that which hath the chiefeſt influence upon their finall condition, is their owne act and election, and therefore God hath ſo appointed guides to us, that if we periſh, it may be accounted upon both our ſcores, upon our own and the guides too, which ſayes plainly, that although we are intruſted to our guides, yet we are intruſted to our ſelves too. Our guides muſt direct us, and yet if they faile, God hath not ſo left us to them, but he hath given us enough to our ſelves to diſcover their failings, and our own duties in all things neceſsary. And for other things we muſt doe as well as we can. But it is beſt to follow our guides, if we know nothing better; but if we doe, it is better to follow the pillar of fire, than a pillar of cloud, though both poſſibly may lead to *Canaan:* But then alſo it is poſſible that it may be otherwiſe. But I am ſure if I doe my own beſt, then if it be beſt to follow a Guide, and if it be alſo neceſsary, I ſhall be ſure by Gods grace and my own endeavour, to get to it; But if I without the particular ingagement of my own underſtanding, follow a guide, poſſibly I may be guilty of extream negligence, or I may extinguiſh Gods Spirit,

Numb. 3.

Ezek. 33.

Spirit, or doe violence to my own reason. And whether intrusting my self wholly with another, be not a laying up my talent in a napkin, I am not so well assured. I am certain the other is not. And since another mans answering for me will not hinder, but that I also shall answer for my self; as it concerns him to see he does not wilfully misguide me, so it concerns me to see that he shall not if I can help it, if I cannot it will not be required at my hands: whether it be his fault, or his invincible error, I shall be charg'd with neither.

Numb. 4. 4. This is no other then what is enjoyned as a duty. For since God will be justified with a free obedience, and there is an obedience of understanding as well as of will and affection, it is of great concernment, as to be willing to beleeve what ever God sayes, so also to enquire diligently whether the will of God be so as is pretended. Even our acts of understanding are acts of choice, and therefore it is commanded as a duty, to *search the Scriptures, to try the Spirits whether they be of God or no, of our selves to be able to judge what is right, to try all things, and to retaine that which is best.* For he that resolves not to consider, resolves not to be carefull whether he have truth or no, and therefore hath an affection indifferent to truth or falshood, which is all one as if he did choose amiss; and since when things are truly propounded and made reasonable and intelligible we cannot but assent, and then it is no thanks to us; we have no way to give our wills to God in matters of beliefe, but by our industry in searching it and examining the grounds upon which the propounders build their dictates. And the not doing it is oftentimes a cause that God gives a man over εἰς νοῦν ἀδόκιμον, into a reprobate and undiscerning mind and understanding.

Mat. 15. 10. Joh. 5. 40. 1 Joh. 4. 1. Ephes. 5. 17. Luk. 24. 25. Rom. 3. 11. 1. 28. Apoc. 2. 2. Act. 17. 11.

Numb. 5. 5. And this very thing (though men will not understand it) is the perpetuall practice of all men in the world that can give a reasonable account of their faith. The very Catholike Church it selfe is *rationabilis & ubiq; diffusa*, saith *Optatus*, reasonable, as well as diffused, every where. For take the Proselites of the Church of *Rome*, even in their greatest submission of understanding, they seem to themselves to follow their reason most of all. For if you tell them, Scripture and Tradition are their rules to follow, they will beleeve you when they know a reason for it,

Lib. 3.

and

and if they take you upon your word, they have a reaſon for that too, either they beleeve you a learned man, or a good man, or that you can have no ends upon them, or ſomething that is of an equall height to fit their underſtandings. If you tell them they muſt beleeve the Church, you muſt tell them why they are bound to it, and if you quote Scripture to prove it, you muſt give them leave to judge, whether the words alledged ſpeak your ſenſe or no, and therefore to diſsent if they ſay no ſuch thing. And although all men are not wiſe, and proceed diſcreetly, yet all make their choice ſome way or other. He that chooſes to pleaſe his fancie takes his choice as much, as he that chooſes prudently. And no man ſpeaks more unreaſonably, then he that denyes to men the uſe of their Reaſon in choice of their Religion. For that I may by the way remove the common prejudice, Reaſon and Authority are not things incompetent or repugnant, eſpecially when the Authority is infallible and ſupreme: for there is no greater reaſon in the world then to beleeve ſuch an authority. But then we muſt conſider, whether every authority that pretends to be ſuch, is ſo indeed. And therefore *Deus dixit, ergo hoc verum eſt*, is the greateſt demonſtration in the world for things of this nature. But it is not ſo in humane dictates, and yet reaſon and humane authority are not enemies. For it is a good argument for us to follow ſuch an opinion, becauſe it is made ſacred by the authority of Councells and Eccleſiaſticall Tradition, and ſometimes it is the beſt reaſon we have in a queſtion, and then it is to be ſtrictly followed; but there may alſo be at other times a reaſon greater than it that ſpeaks againſt it, and then the authority muſt not carry it. But then the difference is not between reaſon and authority, but between this reaſon and that, which is greater: for authority is a very good reaſon, and is to prevaile, unleſs a ſtronger comes and diſarms it, but then it muſt give place. So that in this queſtion by [*Reaſon*] I doe not meane a diſtinct Topick, but a tranſcendent that runs through all Topicks; for Reaſon, like Logick, is inſtrument of all things elſe, and when Revelation, and Philoſophie, and publick Experience, and all other grounds of probability or demonſtration have ſupplyed us with matter, then Reaſon does but make uſe of them; that is, in plain terms, there being ſo many wayes of arguing, ſo many ſects, ſuch differing intereſts, ſuch

variety of authority, so many pretences, and so many false beliefes, it concernes every wise man to consider which is the best argument, which proposition relies upon the truest grounds: & if this were not his only way, why doe men dispute and urge arguments, why do they cite Councels & Fathers, why do they alledge Scripture and Tradition, and all this on all sides, and to contrary purposes? If we must judge, then we must use our reason; if we must not judge, why doe they produce evidence? Let them leave disputing and decree propositions magisterially, but then we may choose whether we will believe them or no; or if they say we must believe them, they must prove it, and tell us why. And all these disputes concerning Tradition, Councells, Fathers, &c. are not arguments against or besides reason, but contestations and pretences to the best arguments, and the most certain satisfaction of our reason. But then all these comming into question, submit themselves to reason, that is, to be judged by humane understanding, upon the best grounds and information it can receive. So that Scripture, Tradition, Councells, and Fathers, are the evidence in a question, but Reason is the Judge: That is, we being the persons that are to be perswaded, we must see that we be perswaded reasonably, and it is unreasonable to assent to a lesser evidence, when a greater and cleerer is propounded, but of that every man for himselfe is to take cognisance if he be able to judge, if he be not, he is not bound under the tye of necessity to know any thing of it; that, that is necessary shall be certainly conveyed to him, God that best can, will certainly take care for that; for if he does not, it becomes to be not necessary; or if it should still remain necessary, and he damned for not knowing it, and yet to know it be not in his power, then who can help it? there can be no further care in this business. In other things, there being no absolute and prime necessity, we are left to our liberty to judge that way that makes best demonstration of our piety and of our love to God and truth, not that way that is alwayes the best argument of an excellent understanding, for this may be a blessing, but the other onely is a duty.

Numb. 6. And now that we are pitch'd upon that way which is most naturall and reasonable in determination of our selves rather then of questions, which are often indeterminable, since right reason pro-

proceeding upon the beſt grounds it can, *viz.* of divine revelation and humane authority, and probability is our guide, (*Stando in humanis*) and ſuppoſing the aſſiſtance of Gods Spirit (which he never denies them that faile not of their duty in all ſuch things in which he requires truth and certainty) it remaines that we conſider how it comes to paſs that men are ſo much deceived in the uſe of their reaſon, and choice of their Religion, and that in this account we diſtinguiſh thoſe accidents which make error innocent from thoſe which make it become a hereſie.

SECT. XI.

Of ſome cauſes of Errour in the exerciſe of Reaſon which are inculpate in themſelves.

1. THen I conſider, that there are a great many inculpable cauſes of Errour, which are arguments of humane imperfections, not convictions of a ſinne. And (1.) the variety of humane underſtandings is ſo great, that what is plaine and apparent to one, is difficult and obſcure to another; one will obſerve a conſequent from a common principle, and another from thence will conclude the quite contrary. When S. *Peter* ſaw the viſion of the ſheet let downe with all ſorts of beaſts in it, and a voice ſaying, *Surge Petre, macta & manduca*, if he had not by a particular aſſiſtance beene directed to the meaning of the holy Ghoſt, poſſibly he might have had other apprehenſions of the meaning of that viſion, for to my ſelfe it ſeemes naturally to ſpeake nothing but the abolition of the Moſaicall rites, and the reſtitution of us to that part of Chriſtian liberty which conſiſts in the promiſcuous eating of meates; and yet beſides this, there want not ſome underſtandings in the world, to whom theſe words ſeeme to give Saint *Peter* a power to kill hereticall Princes. Me thinkes it is a ſtrange underſtanding that makes ſuch extractions, but *Bozius* and *Baronius* did ſo. But men may underſtand what they pleaſe, eſpecially when they are to expound Oracles. It was an argument of ſome wit, but of ſingularity of underſtanding, that happned in the great conteſtation betweene the Miſſalls of Saint *Ambroſe* and Saint *Gregory*. The lot was throwne, and God made *Numb.* 1.

to be Judge, ſo as he was tempted to a miracle, to anſwer a queſtion which themſelves might have ended without much trouble. The two Miſsals were laid upon the Altar, & the Church door ſhut and ſealed. By the morrow Mattins they found *S. Gregories* Miſsall torne in pieces (ſaith the ſtory) and thrown about the Church, but S. *Ambroſe's* open'd and laid upon the Altar in a poſture of being read. If I had been to judge of the meaning of this Miracle, I ſhould have made no ſcruple to have ſaid it had been the will of God that the Miſsall of S. *Ambroſe* which had been anciently uſed, and publickly tryed and approved of, ſhould ſtill be read in the Church, and that of *Gregory* let alone, it being torn by an Angelicall hand as an argument of its imperfection, or of the inconvenience of innovation. But yet they judg'd it otherwiſe, for by the tearing and ſcattering about, they thought it was meant, it ſhould be uſed over all the world, and that of S. *Ambroſe* read onely in the Church of *Millaine*. I am more ſatisfied that the former was the true meaning, then I am of the truth of the ſtory: But we muſt ſuppoſe that. And now there might have been eternal diſputings about the meaning of the miracle, and nothing left to determine, when two fancies are the litigants, and the conteſtations about probabilities *hinc inde*. And I doubt not this was one cauſe of ſo great variety of opinions in the Primitive Church, when they proved their ſeverall opinions which were myſterious queſtions of Chriſtian Theologie, by teſtimonies out of the obſcurer Prophets, out of the Pſalmes and Canticles, as who pleaſe to obſerve their arguments of diſcourſe and actions of Councel ſhall perceive they very much uſed to doe. Now although mens underſtandings be not equall, and that it is fit the beſt underſtandings ſhould prevaile, yet that will not ſatisfie the weaker underſtandings, becauſe all men will not think that another underſtanding is better then his own, at leaſt not in ſuch a particular, in which with fancy he hath pleaſed himſelf. But commonly they that are leaſt able, are moſt bold, and the more ignorant is the more confident, therefore it is but reaſon if he would have another beare with him, he alſo ſhould beare with another, and if he will not be preſcribed to, neither let him preſcribe to others. And there is the more reaſon in this, becauſe ſuch modeſty is commonly to be deſired of the more imperfect; for wiſe men

know

know the ground of their perſwaſion, and have their confidence proportionable to their evidence, others have not, but over-act their trifles: and therefore I ſaid it is but a reaſonable demand, that they that have the leaſt reaſon ſhould not be moſt imperious; and for others it being reaſonable enough, for all their great advantages upon other men, they will be ſoone perſwaded to it; for although wiſe men might be bolder, in reſpect of the perſons of others leſs diſcerning, yet they know there are but few things ſo certaine as to create much boldneſs and confidence of aſsertion. If they doe not, they are not the men I take them for.

2. When an action or opinion is commenc'd with zeale and piety againſt a knowne vice or a vitious perſon, commonly all the miſtakes of it's proceeding are made ſacred by the holineſs of the principle, and ſo abuſes the perſwaſions of good people, that they make it as a Characteriſtick note to diſtinguiſh good perſons from bad; and then whatever error is conſecrated by this means, is therefore made the more laſting, becauſe it is accounted holy, and the perſons are not eaſily accounted hereticks, becauſe they erred upon a pious principle. There is a memorable inſtance in one of the greateſt queſtions of Chriſtendome, *viz.* concerning Images. For when *Philippicus* had eſpyed the images of the ſix firſt Synods upon the front of a Church, he cauſed them to be pulled down; now he did it in hatred of the ſixth Synod: for he being a Monothelite, ſtood condemn'd by that Synod. The Catholiques that were zealous for the ſixth Synod, cauſed the images and repreſentments to be put up againe, and then ſprung the queſtion concerning the lawfullneſs of images in Churches; *Philippicus* and his party ſtrived by ſuppreſſing images to do diſparagement to the ſixth Synod: the Catholiques to preſerve the honour of the ſixth Synod, would uphold images. And then the queſtion came to be changed, and they who were eaſie enough to be perſwaded to pull downe images, were over-awed by a prejudice againſt the *Monothelites*, and the *Monothelites* ſtriv'd to maintain the advantage they had got by a juſt and pious pretence againſt images. The *Monothelites* would have ſecur'd their error by the advantage and conſociation of a truth, & the other would rather defend a dubious and diſputable error, than loſe and let

Numb. 2.

Vid. Paulum Diaconum.

goe a certain truth. And thus the caſe ſtood, and the ſucceſsors of both parts were led invincibly. For when the Hereſie of the Monothelites disbanded, (which it did in a while after) yet the opinion of the Iconoclaſts, & the queſtion of Images grew ſtronger. Yet ſince the Iconoclaſts at the firſt were Heretiques, not for their breaking Images, but for denying the two wils of Chriſt, his Divine and his Humane: that they were called Iconoclaſts was to diſtinguiſh their opinion in the queſtion concerning the Images, but that then Iconoclaſts ſo eaſily had the reputation of Hereticks, was becauſe of the other opinion which was conjunct in their perſons; which opinion men afterwards did not eaſily diſtinguiſh in them, but took them for Hereticks in groſs, and whatſoever they held to be hereticall. And thus upon this prejudice grew great advantages to the veneration of Images, and the perſons at firſt were much to be excuſed, becauſe they were miſguided by that which might have abuſed the beſt men. And if *Epiphanius* who was as zealous againſt Images in Churches as *Philippicus* or *Leo Iſaurus*, had but begun a publike conteſtation, and engaged Emperours to have made Decrees againſt them, Chriſtendom would have had other apprehenſions of it, then they had when the Monothelites began it. For few men will endure a truth from the mouth of the Devill, and if the perſon be ſuſpected, ſo are his wayes too. And it is a great ſubtlety of the Devil ſo to temper truth and falſhood in the ſame perſon, that truth may loſe much of its reputation by its mixture with error, and the error may become more plauſible by reaſon of its conjunction with truth. And this we ſee by too much experience, for we ſee many truths are blaſted in their reputation, becauſe perſons whom we think we hate upon juſt grounds of Religion, have taught them. And it was plain enough in the caſe of *Maldonat*, that ſaid of an explication of a place of Scripture, that it was moſt agreeable to Antiquity, but becauſe *Calvin* had ſo expounded it, he therefore choſe a new one. This was malice. But when a prejudice works tacitely, undiſcernably, and irreſiſtably upon the perſon ſo wrought upon, the man is to be pityed, not condemned, though poſſibly his opinion deſerves it highly. And therefore it hath been uſuall to diſcredit doctrines by the perſonall defaillances of them that preach them: or with the diſreputation of that

In cap 6. Iohan.

ſect

sect that maintains them in conjunction with other perverse doctrines. *Faustus* the Manichee in S. *Austin*, glories much, that in their Religion God was worshipped purely and without Images. S. *Austin* liked it well, for so it was in his too, but from hence *Sanders* concludes, that to pull down Images in Churches was the heresie of the Manichees. The Jews endure no Images, therefore *Bellarmine* makes it to be a piece of Judaisme to oppose them. He might as well have concluded against saying our prayers, and Church musick, that it is Judaicall, because the Jews used it. And he would be loth to be served so himself, for he that had a mind to use such arguments, might with much better probability conclude against their Sacrament of extreme unction, because when the miraculous healing was ceased, then they were not Catholiques, but Heretiques that did transferre it to the use of dying persons, (sayes *Irenæus*;) for so did the Valentinians: And indeed this argument is something better then I thought for at first, because it was in *Irenæus* time reckoned among the heresies. But there are a sort of men that are even with them, and hate some good things which the Church of *Rome* teaches, because she who teaches so many errors, hath been the publisher, and is the practicer of those things. I confess the thing is alwayes unreasonable, but sometimes it is invincible and innocent; and then may serve to abate the fury of all such decretory sentences, as condemne all the world but their own Disciples.

L. 20. c. 3. cont. Faustum Man.
L. 1. c. ult. de Imagin.
De reliq. SS. l. 2. c. 6. Sect. Nicolaus.
L. 1 c. 8. adv. hær.

3. There are some opinions that have gone hand in hand with a blessing, and a prosperous profession; and the good success of their defenders hath amused many good people, because they thought they heard Gods voice where they saw Gods hand, and therefore have rushed upon such opinions with great piety and as great mistaking. For where they once had entertain'd a feare of God, and apprehension of his so sensible declaration, such a feare produces scruple, and a scrupulous conscience is alwayes to be pityed, because though it is seldome wise, it is alwayes pious. And this very thing hath prevail'd so farre upon the understandings even of wise men, that *Bellarmine* makes it a note of the true Church. Which opinion when it prevailes is a ready way to make, that instead of Martyrs all men should prove hereticks or apostates in persecution; for since men in misery are very suspici-

Numb. 3.

ous,

ous, out of strong desires to finde out the cause, that by removing it they may be relieved, they apprehend that to be it that is first presented to their fears; and then if ever truth be afflicted, she shall also be destroyed. I will say nothing in defiance of this fancy, although all the experience in the world sayes it is false, and that of all men Christians should least believe it to be true, to whom a perpetuall crosse is their certain expectation, (and the argument is like the Moone, for which no garment can be fit, it alters according to the success of humane affairs, and in one age will serve a Papist, and in another a Protestant) yet when such an opinion does prevaile upon timerous persons, the malignity of their error (if any be consequent to this fancie, and taken up upon the reputation of a prosperous heresie) is not to be considered simply and nakedly, but abatement is to be made in a just proportion to that feare, and to that apprehension.

Numb. 4. 4. Education is so great and so invincible a prejudice, that he who masters the inconvenience of it, is more to be commended than he can justly be blam'd that complyes with it. For men doe not alwayes call them principles which are the prime fountaines of reason, from whence such consequents naturally flow, as are to guide the actions and discourses of men; but they are principles which they are first taught, which they suckt in next to their milke, and by a proportion to those first principles they usually take their estimate of propositions. For whatsoever is taught to them at first they believe infinitely, for they know nothing to the contrary, they have had no other masters, whose theoremes might abate the strength of their first perswasions, and it is a great advantage in those cases to get possession; and before their first principles can be dislodg'd, they are made habituall and complexionall, it is in their nature then to believe them, and this is helped forward very much by the advantage of love and veneration which we have to the first parents of our perswasions. And we see it in the orders of Regulars in the Church of *Rome*. That opinion which was the opinion of their Patron or Founder, or of some eminent Personage of the Institute, is enough to engage all the Order to be of that opinion; and it is strange that all the Dominicans should be of one opinion in the matter of Predetermination,

termination and immaculate conception, and all the Franciſcans of the quite contrary, as if their underſtandings were form'd in a different mold, and furniſhed with various principles by their very rule. Now this prejudice works by many principles, but how ſtrongly they doe poſſeſs the underſtanding is viſible in that great inſtance of the affection and perfect perſwaſion the weaker ſort of people have to that which they call the Religion of their Forefathers. You may as well charm a feaver aſleep with the noiſe of bells, as make any pretence of reaſon againſt that Religion which old men have intayl'd upon their heirs male ſo many generations till they can preſcribe. And the Apoſtles found this to be moſt true in the extremeſt difficulty they met with, to conteſt againſt the rites of *Moſes*, and the long ſuperſtition of the Gentiles, which they therefore thought fit to be retain'd, becauſe they had done ſo formerly, *Pergentes non quo eundum eſt, ſed quo itur*, and all the bleſſings of this life which God gave them, they had in conjunction with their Religion, and therefore they beleeved it was for their Religion, and this perſwaſion was bound faſt in them with ribs of iron, the Apoſtles were forc'd to unlooſe the whole conjuncture of parts & principles in their underſtandings, before they could make them malleable and receptive of any impreſſes. But the obſervation and experience of all wiſe men can juſtifie this truth. All that I ſhall ſay to the preſent purpoſe, is this, that conſideration is to be had to the weakneſs of perſons when they are prevail'd upon by ſo innocent a prejudice, and when there cannot be arguments ſtrong enough to over-maſter an habituall perſwaſion bred with a man, nouriſh'd up with him, that alwayes eat at his table, and lay in his boſome, he is not eaſily to be called Heretique, for if he keeps the foundation of faith, other articles are not ſo cleerly demonſtrated on either ſide, but that a man may innocently be abuſed to the contrary. And therefore in this caſe to handle him charitably, is but to doe him juſtice: And when an opinion *in minoribus articulis*, is entertain'd upon the title and ſtock of education, it may be the better permitted to him, ſince upon no better ſtock nor ſtronger arguments, moſt men entertain their whole Religion, even Chriſtianity it ſelfe.

Optima vati ea quæ magno aſſenſu, recepta ſunt, quorum; exempla multa ſint, nec ad rationem, ſed ad ſimilitudinem vivimus. Sen. Vid. Minut. Fel. octav.

5. There are ſome perſons of a differing perſwaſion, who there- *Numb.* 5.

fore are the rather to be tolerated, becauſe the indirect practices and impoſtures of their adverſaries have confirmed them, that thoſe opinions which they diſavow, are not from God, as being upheld by means not of Gods appointment: For it is no unreaſonable diſcourſe to ſay, that God will not be ſerved with a lye, for he does not need one, and he hath means enough to ſupport all thoſe truths which he hath commanded, and hath ſupplyed every honeſt cauſe with enough for its maintenance, and to conteſt againſt its adverſaries. And (but that they which uſe indirect arts will not be willing to loſe any of their unjuſt advantages, nor yet be charitable to thoſe perſons, whom either to gain or to undoe they leave nothing unattempted) the Church of *Rome* hath much reaſon not to be ſo decretory in her ſentences againſt perſons of a differing perſwaſion, for if their cauſe were entirely the cauſe of God, they have given wiſe people reaſon to ſuſpect it, becauſe ſome of them have gone to the Devill to defend it. And if it be remembred what tragedies were ſtirred up againſt *Luther*, for ſaying, the Devill had taught him an argument againſt the Maſs, it will be of as great advantage againſt them, that they goe to the Devill for many arguments to ſupport not onely the Maſs, but the other diſtinguiſhing Articles of their Church: I inſtance in the notorious forging of Miracles, and framing of falſe and ridiculous Legends. For the former I need no other inſtances then what hapned in the great conteſtation about the immaculate conception, when there were Miracles brought on both ſides to prove the contradictory parts; and though it be more then probable that both ſides play'd the jugglers, yet the Dominicans had the ill luck to be diſcovered, and the actors burn'd at *Berne*. But this diſcovery hapned by providence; for the Dominican opinion hath more degrees of probability then the Franciſcan; is cleerly more conſonant both to Scripture and all antiquity, and this part of it is acknowledged by the greateſt Patrons themſelves, as *Salmeron*, *Poſa* and *Wadding*, yet becauſe they played the knaves in a juſt queſtion, and uſed falſe arts to maintain a true propoſition, God Almighty to ſhew that he will not be ſerved by a lye, was pleaſed rather to diſcover the impoſture in the right opinion then in the falſe, ſince nothing is more diſhonourable to God, then to offer a ſin in ſacrifice to him, and nothing more in-

cong u-

congruous in the nature of the thing, then that truth and falſhood ſhould ſupport each other, or that true doctrine ſhould live at the charges of a lye. And he that conſiders the arguments for each opinion will eaſily conclude, that if God would not have truth confirmed by a lye, much leſſe would he himſelf atteſt a lye with a true miracle. And by this ground it will eaſily follow, that the Franciſcan party, although they had better luck then the Dominicans, yet had not more honeſty, becauſe their cauſe was worſe, and therefore their arguments no whit the better. And although the argument drawn from miracles is good to atteſt a holy doctrine, which by its own worth will ſupport it ſelfe, after way is a little made by miracles, yet of it ſelfe and by its owne reputation it will not ſupport any fabrick; for inſtead of proving a doctrine to be true, it makes that the miracles themſelves are ſuſpected to be illuſions, if they be pretended in behalfe of a doctrine, which we think we have reaſon to account falſe. And therefore the Jews did not beleeve Chriſts doctrine for his Miracles, but dis-beleeved the truth of his Miracles, becauſe they did not like his doctrine. And if the holineſſe of his doctrine, and the Spirit of God by inſpirations and infuſions, and by that which Saint *Peter* calls *a ſurer word of prophecy*, had not atteſted the Divinity both of his Perſon and his Office, we ſhould have wanted many degrees of confidence which now we have upon the truth of Chriſtian Religion. But now ſince we are fore-told by this *ſurer word of prophecy*, that is, the prediction of Jeſus Chriſt, that Antichriſt ſhould come in all wonders, and ſigns, and lying miracles, and that the Church ſaw much of that already verified in *Simon Magus*, *Apollonius Tyaneus*, and *Manetho*, and divers * Heretiques, it is now come to that paſſe, that the argument in its beſt advantage proves nothing ſo much as that the doctrine which it pretends to prove, is to be ſuſpected, becauſe it was foretold that falſe doctrine ſhould be obtruded under ſuch pretences. But then when not onely true miracles are an inſufficient argument to prove a truth ſince the eſtabliſhment of Chriſtianity, but that the miracles themſelves are falſe and ſpurious, it makes that doctrine in whoſe defence they come, juſtly to be ſuſpected, becauſe they are a demonſtration that the intereſted perſons uſe all means, leave nothing unattempted to prove their propoſitions,

Vid. Baron. Æ. D. 68. n. 22. Philoſtrat. l. 4. T. 485. compend. Cedren. p. 202.

* Stapleton. prompt. Moral. pars æſtiva, p. 627.

ons; but since they so faile as to bring nothing from God, but something from the Devill for its justification, it's a great signe that the doctrine is false, because we know the Devill, unless it be against his will, does nothing to prove a true proposition that makes against him. And now then those persons who will endure no man of another opinion, might doe well to remember how by their exorcismes, their Devils tricks at *Lowdon*, and the other side pretending to cure mad folkes and persons bewitched, and the many discoveries of their jugling, they have given so much reason to their adversaries to suspect their doctrine, that either they must not be ready to condemne their persons who are made suspicious by their indirect proceeding in attestation of that which they value so high as to call their Religion, or else they must condemne themselves for making the scandall active and effectuall.

Numb. 4. As for false Legends, it will be of the same consideration, because they are false Testimonies of Miracles that were never done, which differs onely from the other as a lye in words from a lye in action, but of this we have witness enough in that decree of Pope *Leo* X. session the eleventh, of the last Lateran Councell, where he excommunicates all the forgers and inventors of visions and false Miracles, which is a testimony that it was then a practice so publicke as to need a Law for its suppression; and if any man shall doubt whether it were so or not, let him see the *Centum gravamina* of the Princes of *Germany* where it is highly complain'd of. But the extreme stupidity and sottishness of the inventors of lying stories is so great, as to give occasion to some persons to suspect the truth of all Church * story, witness the Legend of *Lombardy*: of the author of which the Bishop of the *Canaries* gives this Testimony, *In illo enim libro miraculorum monstra sæpius quam vera miracula legas. Hunc homo scripsit ferrei oris, plumbei cordis, animi certe parum severi & prudentis.* But I need not descend so low, for Saint *Gregory* and *V. Bede* themselves reported miracles, for the authority of which they only had the report of the common people, and it is not certaine that S. *Hierome* had so much in his stories of S. *Paul* and S. *Anthony*, and the *Fauns* and the *Satyrs* which appear'd to them, and desir'd their Prayers. But I shall onely by way of eminency, note what Sir *Thomas*

* τὰ δὲ μὴ εἰρημένα ἐκβιάζομεν, καὶ τὰ ἀληθῶς εἰρημένα ἀποπλύνομεν ὑδατι διαλύοντες. Ihu. Pelus.

Vid. L. 11. loc. Theol. cap. 6.

Canus ibid.

Thomas More ſayes in his Epiſtle to *Ruthal* the Kings Secretary before the Dialogue of *Lucian* [*Philopſeudes*] that therefore he undertook the tranſlation of that dialogue, to free the world from a ſuperſtition that crept in under the face and title of Religion. For ſuch lyes (ſayes he) are tranſmitted to us with ſuch authority that a certaine impoſtor had perſwaded S. *Auſtin*, that the very fable which *Lucian* ſcoffes, makes ſport withall in that *Dialogue was a reall ſtory, and acted in his owne dayes. The Epiſtle is worth the reading to this purpoſe; but he ſayes this abuſe grew to ſuch a height, that ſcarce any life of any Saint or Martyr is truly related, but is full of lyes and lying wonders, and ſome perſons thought they ſerved God if they did honour to God's Saints by inventing ſome prodigious ſtory, or miracle for their reputation. So that now it is no wonder if the moſt pious men are apt to believe, and the greateſt hiſtorians are eaſie enough to report ſuch ſtories, which ſerving to a good end, are alſo conſigned by the report of perſons, otherwiſe pious and prudent enough. I will not inſtance in *Vincentius* his *ſpeculum*, *Turonenſis*, *Thomas Cantipratanus*, *John Herolt*, *Vitæ Patrum*, nor the revelations of Saint *Briget* though confirmed by two Popes, *Martin* V. and *Boniface* IX. even the beſt and moſt deliberate amongſt them, *Lippoman*, *Surius*, *Lipſius Bzovius*, and *Baronius* are ſo full of fables that they cauſe great diſreputation to the other Monuments and records of antiquity, and yet doe no advantage to the cauſe under which they ſerve and take pay. They doe no good and much hurt; but yet accidentally they may procure this advantage to charity, ſince they doe none to faith; that ſince they have ſo abuſed the credit of ſtory that our confidences want much of that ſupport we ſhould receive from her records of antiquity, yet the men that diſſent and are ſcandaliz'd by ſuch proceedings ſhould be excuſed if they ſhould chance to be afraid of truth that hath put on garments of impoſture: and ſince much violence is done to the *truth & certainty* of their judging, let none be done to their *liberty* of judging: ſince they cannot meet a right guide, let them have a charitable judge. And ſince it is one very great argument againſt *Simon Magus* and againſt *Mahomet* that we can prove their miracles to be impoſtures, it is much to be pittied if timorous and ſuſpitious perſons ſhall invincibly and honeſtly

* Vid. *De duobus ſui ordinis, altero decedente, altero in vitam redeunte poſt viginti dies; quam in aliis nominibus videt Lucianus. Vide etiam argumentum Gilberti Cognati, in Annotat. in hunc Dialog.*

Vid. Palæot. de ſacra ſindone, part 1. Epiſt. ad Lector.

leſſe apprehend a truth which they ſee conveyed by ſuch a teſtimony which we all uſe as an argument to reprove the Mahumetan ſuperſtition.

Numb. 7. 6. Here alſo comes in all the weakneſſes and trifling prejudices which operate not by their own ſtrength, but by advantage taken from the weakneſſe of ſome underſtandings. Some men by a Proverb or a common ſaying are determin'd to the beliefe of a propoſition, for which they have no argument better then ſuch a Proverbiall ſentence. And when divers of the common People in *Jeruſalem* were ready to yeild their underſtandings to the beliefe of the Meſſias, they were turn'd cleerly from their apprehenſions by that proverb, *looke and ſee, does any good thing come from Galilee?* And this, *when Chriſt comes, no man knowes from whence he is*; but this man was knowne of what parents, of what City. And thus the weakneſſe of their underſtanding was abuſed, and that made the argument too hard for them. And the whole ſeventh Chapter of Saint *Johns* Goſpell is a perpetuall inſtance of the efficacy of ſuch trifling prejudices, and the vanity and weakneſſe of popular underſtandings. Some whole ages have beene abuſed by a definition, which being once received, as moſt commonly they are upon ſlight grounds, they are taken for certaintyes in any ſcience reſpectively, and for principles, and upon their reputation men uſe to frame concluſions, which muſt be falſe or uncertaine according as the definitions are. And he that hath obſerv'd anything of the weakneſſes of men, and the ſucceſſions of groundleſſe doctrines from age to age, and how ſeldome definitions which are put into ſyſtemes, or that derive from the Fathers, or approved among Shool-men are examined by perſons of the ſame intereſts, will beare me witneſſe, how many and great inconveniences preſſe hard upon the perſwaſions of men, who are abuſed and yet never conſider who hurt them. Others, and they very many, are lead by authority or examples of Princes, & great perſonages, *Numquis credit ex Principibus?* Some by the reputation of one learned man are carryed into any perſwaſion whatſoever. And in the middle and latter ages of the Church, this was the more conſiderable, becauſe the infinite ignorance of the Clerks, and the men of the long robe gave them over to be lead by thoſe few guides which were mark'd to them by an eminency,

Joh. 7.

much

much more then their ordinary: which alſo did the more amuſe them, becauſe moſt commonly they were fit for nothing but to admire what they underſtood not; their learning then was in ſome skill in the Maſter of the Sentences, in *Aquinas* or *Scotus* whom they admir'd next to the moſt intelligent order of Angels; hence came opinions that made Sects & diviſion of names, Thomiſts, Scotiſts, Albertiſts, Nominalls, Realls, and I know not what monſters of names; and whole families of the ſame opinion, the whole inſtitute of an Order being ingag'd to believe according to the opinion of ſome leading man of the ſame Order, as if ſuch an opinion were impoſed upon them *in vitute ſanctæ obedientiæ*. But this inconvenience is greater when the principle of the miſtake runs higher, when the opinion is deriv'd from a Primitive man and a Saint, for then it often happens that what at firſt was but a plain innocent ſeduction, comes to be made ſacred by the veneration which is conſequent to the perſon for having lived long agone; and then, becauſe the perſon is alſo ſince canoniz'd, the error is almoſt made eternall, and the cure deſperate. Theſe and the like prejudices which are as various as the miſeries of humanity or the variety of humane underſtandings are not abſolute excuſes, unleſſe to ſome perſons, but truly if they be to any, they are exemptions to all, from being preſſed with too peremptory a ſentence againſt them, eſpecially if we conſider what leave is given to all men by the church of *Rome* to follow any one probable Doctor in an opinion which is conteſted againſt by many more. And as for the Doctors of the other ſide, they being deſtitute of any pretences to an infallible *medium* to determine queſtions, muſt of neceſſity allow the ſame liberty to the people, to be as prudent as they can in the choice of a fallible guide; and when they have choſen, if they doe follow him into error, the matter is not ſo inexpiable for being deceiv'd in uſing the beſt guides we had, which guides becauſe themſelves were abuſed, did alſo againſt their wills deceive me. So that this prejudice may the eaſier abuſe us, becauſe it is almoſt like a duty to follow the dictates of a probable Doctor, or if it be over-acted or accidentally paſſe into an inconvenience, it is therefore to be excuſed becauſe the principle was not ill, unleſſe we judge by our event, not by the antecedent probability. Of ſuch men as theſe it was

ſaid

Contr. Fund. c. 4. said by Saint *Austin*, *Ceteram turbam non intelligendi vivacitas, sed credendi simplicitas tutissimam facit.* And *Gregory Nazianzen*,

Orat. 21. οὐ ζητεῖ πολλὰκις τὸν λαὸν τὸ ἀσφαλέστερον. The common sort of people are safe in their not inquiring by their owne industry, and in the simplicity of their understanding relying upon the best guides theycan get.

Numb. 6. But this is of such a nature in which as we may inculpably be deceived, so we may turne it into a vice or a designe, and then the consequent errors will alter the property, and become heresies. There are some men that have mens persons in admiration because of advantage, and some that have itching eares, and heap up teachers to themselves. In these and the like cases the authority of a person, and the prejudices of a great reputation is not the excuse but the fault : And a sinne is so farre from excusing an Errour, that Errour becomes a sinne by reason of it's relation to that sinne as to it's parent and principle.

SECT. XII.

Of the innocency of Errour in opinion in a pious person.

Numb. 1. AND therefore as there are so many innocent causes of Error, as there are weaknesses within, and harmlesse and unavoydable prejudices from without, so if ever errour be procured by a vice it hath no excuse, but becomes such a crime, of so much malignity, as to have influence upon the effect and consequent, and by communication makes it become criminall. The Apostles noted two such causes: *Covetousness* & *Ambition*, the former in them of the Circumcision, and the latter in *Diotrephes* and *Simon Magus*; and there were some that were ἀγόμενοι ἐπιθυμίαις ποικίλαις

2 Tim. 3. they were of the long robe too, but they were the she-Disciples, upon whose Consciences some false Apostles had influence by advantage of their wantonness, and thus the three principles of all sinne become also the principles of heresie, the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life. And in pursuance of these arts the Devill hath not wanted fuell to set aworke incendiaries

diaries in all ages of the church. The Biſhops were alwayes honourable, and moſt commonly had great revenues, and a Biſhoprick would ſatisfie the two deſigns of Covetouſneſſe and Ambition, and this hath been the golden apple very often contended for, and very often the cauſe of great fires in the Church. *Thebulis quia rejectus ab Epiſcopatu Hieroſolymitano, turbare cœpit Eccleſiam,* ſaid *Egeſippus* in *Euſebius*. *Tertullian* turn'd Montaniſt in diſcontent for miſſing the Biſhoprick of *Carthage* after *Agrippinus*, and ſo did *Montanus* himſelfe for the ſame diſcontent, ſaith *Nicephorus*. *Novatus* would have been Biſhop of *Rome*, *Donatus* of *Carthage*, *Arrius* of *Alexandria*, *Aerius* of *Sebaſtia*, but they all miſſed, and therefore all of them vexed Chriſtendome. And this was ſo common a thing, that oftentimes, the threatning the Church with a ſchiſme, or a hereſie, was a deſign to get a Biſhoprick: And *Socrates* reports of *Aſterius*, that he did frequent the Conventicles of the Arrians; *Nam Epiſcopatum aliquem ambiebat.* And ſetting aſide the infirmities of men, and their innocent prejudices; *Epiphanius* makes pride to be the onely cauſe of hereſies, ὕβρις καὶ προκρισις, Pride and Prejudice cauſe them all, the one criminally, the other innocently. And indeed S. *Paul* does almoſt make pride the onely cauſe of hereſies, his words cannot be expounded, unleſſe it be at leaſt the principall, εἴ τις ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖ, *and conſents not to ſound words, and the doctrine that is according to godlineſſe,* τετύφωται μηδὲν ἐπιστάμενος, ἀλλὰ νοσῶν περὶ ζητήσεις καὶ λογομαχίας, ἐξ ὧν γίνεται φθόνος, ἔρεις, βλασφημίαι, ὑπόνοιαι πονηραί.

The ſumme is this, If ever an opinion be begun with pride, or manag'd with impiety, or ends in a crime; the man turns Heretique: but let the error be never ſo great, ſo it be not againſt an Article of Creed, if it be ſimple and hath no confederation with the perſonall iniquity of the man, the opinion is as innocent as the perſon, though perhaps as falſe as he is ignorant, and therefore ſhall burne though he himſelfe eſcape. But in theſe caſes and many more, (for the cauſes of deception increaſe by all accidents, and weakneſſes, and illuſions) no man can give certaine judgement upon the perſons of men in particular, unleſſe the matter of fact and crime be accident and notorious. The man cannot by humane judgement be concluded a heretique, unleſſe his opinion be an open receſſion from plaine demonſtrative divine authority *Numb.* 2.

(which muſt needs be notorious, voluntary, vincible and criminal) or that there be a palpable ſerving of an end accidentall and extrinſecall to the opinion.

Numb. 3. But this latter is very hard to be diſcerned, becauſe thoſe accidentall and adherent crimes which makes the man a heretique, in queſtions not ſimply fundamentall or of neceſſary practice, are actions ſo internall and ſpirituall, that cognizance can but ſeldome be taken of them. And therefore (to inſtance) though the opinion of Purgatory be falſe, yet to beleeve it cannot be hereſie, if a man be abuſed into the beliefe of it invincibly, becauſe it is not a Doctrine either fundamentally falſe or practically impious, it neither proceeds from the will, nor hath any immediate or direct influence upon choice and manners. And as for thoſe other ends of upholding that opinion which poſſibly its Patrons may have, as for the reputation of their Churches infallibility, for the advantage of Derges, Requiems, Maſſes, Monthly minds, Anniverſaries, and other offices for the dead, which uſually are very profitable, rich and eaſie, theſe things may poſſibly have ſole influences upon their underſtanding, but whether they have or no God only knowes. If the propoſition and article were true, theſe ends might juſtly be ſubordinate and conſiſtent with a true propoſition. And there are ſome truths that are alſo profitable, as the neceſſity of maintenance to the Clergy, the Doctrine of reſtitution, giving Almes, lending freely, remitting debts in caſes of great neceſſity: and it would be but an ill argument that the preachers of theſe doctrines ſpeake falſe, becauſe poſſibly in theſe articles they may ſerve their owne ends. For although *Demetrius* and the Crafts-men were without excuſe for reſiſting the Preaching of S. *Paul*, becauſe it was notorious they reſiſted the truth upon ground of profit and perſonall emoluments, and the matter was confeſſed by themſelves, yet if the Clergie ſhould maintaine their juſt rites and Revenues which by pious dedications and donatives were long ſince aſcertained upon them, is it to be preſumed in order of Law and charity, that this end is in the men ſubordinate to truth, becauſe it is ſo in the thing it ſelfe, and that therefore no judgement in prejudice of theſe truths can be made from that obſervation?

But

But if *aliunde* we are aſcertain'd of the truth or falſhood of a propoſition reſpectively, yet the judgement of the perſonall ends of the men, cannot ordinarily be certaine and judiciall, becauſe moſt commonly the acts are private, and the purpoſes internall, and temporall ends may ſometimes conſiſt with truth, and whether the purpoſes of the men make theſe ends principall or ſubordinate, no man can judge; and be they how they will, yet they doe not alwayes prove that when they are conjunct with error, that the error was cauſed by theſe purpoſes and criminall intentions. *Numb.* 4.

But in queſtions practicall, the doctrine it ſelfe and the perſon too, may with more eaſe be reproved, becauſe matter of fact being evident, and nothing being ſo certaine as the experiments of humane affaires, and theſe being the immediate conſequents of ſuch doctrines, are with ſome more certainty of obſervation redargued, then the ſpeculative; whoſe judgement is of it ſelf more difficult, more remote from matter and humane obſervation, and with leſſe curioſity and expliciteneſſe declared in Scripture as being of leſſe conſequence and concernment in order to Gods and Man's great end. In other things which end in notion and ineffective contemplation, where neither the doctrine is malicious, nor the perſon apparently criminall, he is to be left to the judgement of God, and as there is no certainty of humane judicature in this caſe, ſo it is to no purpoſe it ſhould be judged. For if the perſon may be innocent with his Error, and there is no rule whereby he can certainly be pronounced, that he is actually criminall; (as it happens in matters ſpeculative.) Since the end of the Commandment is love out of *a pure conſcience, and faith unfained*; and the Commandment may obtaine its end in a conſiſtence with this ſimple ſpeculative Errour, Why ſhould men trouble themſelves with ſuch opinions, ſo as to diſturbe the publicke charity or the private confidence? Opinions and perſons are juſt ſo to be judged as other matters and perſons criminall. For no man can judge any thing elſe: it muſt be a crime, and it muſt be open, ſo as to take cognizance, and make true humane judgement of it. And this is all I am to ſay concerning the cauſes of hereſies, and of the diſtinguiſhing rules for guiding of our judgments towards others. *Numb.* 5.

Numb. 6. As for guiding our judgements and the uſe of our reaſon in judging for our ſelves, all that is to be ſaid is reducible to this one propoſition. Since errors are then made ſinnes when they are contrary to charity or inconſiſtent with a good life and the honour of God, that judgement is the trueſt, or at leaſt that opinion moſt innocent that 1. beſt promotes the reputation of Gods Glory, and 2. is the beſt inſtrument of holy life. For in queſtions and interpretations of diſpute, theſe two analogies are the beſt to make propoſitions, & conjectures and determinations. Diligence and care in obtaining the beſt guides, and the moſt convenient aſſiſtances, prayer, and modeſty of ſpirit, ſimplicity of purpoſes and intentions, humility and aptneſſe to learn, & a peaceable diſpoſition, are therefore neceſſary to finding out truths, becauſe they are parts of good life, without which our truths will doe us little advantage, and our errours can have no excuſe, but with theſe diſpoſitions as he is ſure to find out all that is neceſſary, ſo what truth he inculpably miſſes of, he is ſure is therefore not neceſſary, becauſe he could not finde it when he did his beſt and his moſt innocent endeavours. And this I ſay to ſecure the perſons; becauſe no rule can antecedently ſecure the propoſition in matters diſputable. For even in the proportions and explications of this rule there is infinite variety of diſputes: And when the diſpute is concerning free will, one partie denyes it becauſe he beleeves it magnifies the grace of God, that it workes irreſiſtably; the other affirmes, becauſe he beleeves it engages us upon greater care and piety of our endeavours. The one opinion thinks God reapes the glory of our good actions, the other thinks it charges our bad actions upon him. So in the queſtion of merit, one part chooſes his aſſertion becauſe he thinks it incourages us to doe good works, the other beleeves it makes us proud, and therefore he rejects it. The firſt beleeves it increaſes piety, the ſecond beleeves it increaſes ſpirituall preſumption and vanity. The firſt thinks it magnifies God's juſtice, the other thinks it derogates from his mercy. Now then, ſince neither this nor any ground can ſecure a man from poſſibility of miſtaking, we were infinitely miſerable if it would not ſecure us from puniſhment, ſo long as we willingly conſent not to a crime, and doe our beſt endeavour to avoid an errour. Onely by the way, let me obſerve, that

that ſince there are ſuch great differences of apprehenſion concerning the conſequents of an article, no man is to be charged with the odious conſequences of his opinion. Indeed his doctrine is, but the perſon is not, if he underſtands not ſuch things to be conſequent to his Doctrine; for if he did, and then avows them, they are his direct opinions, & he ſtands as chargeable with them as with his firſt propoſitions; but if he diſ-avowes them, he would certainly rather quit his opinion then avow ſuch errours or impieties, which are pretended to be conſequent to it, becauſe every man knows that can be no truth, from whence falſhood naturally and immediately does derive, and he therefore beleeves his firſt propoſition, becauſe he beleeves it innocent of ſuch errors as are charg'd upon it directly or conſequently.

So that now, ſince no error neither for its ſelfe nor its conſequents is to be charg'd as criminall upon a pious perſon, ſince no ſimple errour is a ſin, nor does condemne us before the throne of God, ſince he is ſo pittifull to our crimes, that he pardons many *de toto & integro*, in all makes abatement for the violence of temptation, and the ſurprizall and invaſion of our faculties, and therefore much leſſe will demand of us an account for our weakneſſes; and ſince the ſtrongeſt underſtanding cannot pretend to ſuch an immunity and exemption from the condition of men, as not to be deceived and confeſſe its weakneſſe; it remaines we inquire what deportment is to be uſed towards perſons of a differing perſwaſion, when we are (I doe not ſay doubtfull of a propoſition, but) convinc'd that he that differs from us is in Errour, for this was the firſt intention, and the laſt end of this diſcourſe. *Numb.* 7.

SECT. XIII.

Of the deportment to be uſed towards perſons diſagreeing, and the reaſons why they are not to be puniſhed with death, &c.

FOr although every man may be deceived, yet ſome are right and may know it too, for every man that may erre, does not therefore certainly erre, and if he erres becauſe he recedes from his rule, then if he followes it he may doe right, and if ever *Numb.* 1.

any man upon juſt grounds did change his opinion, then he was in the right and was ſure of it too, and although confidence is miſtaken for a juſt perſwaſion many times, yet ſome men are confident, and have reaſon ſo to be. Now when this happens, the queſtion is what deportment they are to uſe towards perſons that diſagree from them, and by conſequence are in error.

Numb. 2. 1. Then no Chriſtian is to be put to death, diſmembred, or otherwiſe directly perſecuted for his opinion, which does not teach impiety or blaſphemy. If it plainly and apparently brings in a crime, and himſelfe does act it or incourage it, then the matter of fact is puniſhable according to its proportion or malignity; as if he preaches treaſon or ſedition, his opinion is not his excuſe, becauſe it brings in a crime, and a man is never the leſſe traitor, becauſe he beleeves it lawful to commit treaſon; & a man is a murtherer if he kills his brother unjuſtly, although he thinks he does God good ſervice in it. Matters of fact are equally judicable whether the principle of them be from within or from without: And if a man could pretend to innocence in being ſeditious, blaſphemous, or perjur'd by perſwading himſelf it is lawfull, there were as great a gate opened to all iniquity, as will entertaine all the pretences, the deſignes, the impoſtures, and diſguiſes of the world. And therefore God hath taken order that all rules concerning matters of fact and good life ſhall be ſo cleerely explicated, that without the crime of the man, he cannot be ignorant of all his practicall duty. And therefore the Apoſtles and primitive Doctors made no ſcruple of condemning ſuch perſons for hereticks, that did dogmatize a ſinne. He that teaches others to ſinne, is worſe then he that commits the crime, whether he be tempted by his owne intereſt, or incouraged by the others doctrine. It was as bad in *Baſilides* to teach it to be lawfull to renounce Faith and Religion, and take all manner of Oathes and Covenants in time of perſecution, as if himſelfe had done ſo; nay it is as much worſe, as the miſcheife is more univerſall, or as a fountaine is greater then a drop of water taken from it. He that writes Treaſon in a booke, or preaches Sedition in a Pulpit, and perſwades it to the people, is the greateſt Traitor and incendiary, and his opinion there is the fountaine of a ſinne, and therefore could not be entertain'd in his underſtanding

upon

upon weakneſſe, or inculpable or innocent prejudice; he cannot from Scripture or divine revelation have any pretence to colour that ſo fairely as to ſeduce either a wiſe or an honeſt man. If it reſt there and goes no further, it is not cognoſcible, and ſo ſcapes that way; but if it be publiſhed and comes *à ſtylo ad Machæram* (as *Tertullians* phraſe is) then it becomes matter of fact in principle and in perſwaſion, and is juſt ſo puniſhable, as is the crime that it perſwades: ſuch were they of whom S. *Paul* complaines, who brought in damnable doctrines and luſts. S. *Pauls* *Gal. 5.* *Utinam abſcindantur* is juſt of them, take it in any ſenſe of rigour and ſeverity, ſo it be proportionable to the crime, or criminall doctrine. Such were thoſe of whom God ſpake in *Deut.* 13. If any Prophet tempts to idolatry, ſaying, let us goe after other Gods, he ſhall be ſlaine. But theſe doe not come into this queſtion. But the propoſition is to be underſtood concerning queſtions diſputable in *materiâ intellectuali*, which alſo for all that law of killing, ſuch falſe Prophets were permitted with impunity in the Synagogue, as appeares beyond exception in the great diviſions and diſputes betweene the Phariſees and the Sadduces. I deny not but certaine and knowne idolatry or any other ſort of practicall impiety with its principiant doctrine may be puniſhed corporally, becauſe it is no other but matter of fact, but no matter of meere opinion, no errors that of themſelves are not ſins are to be perſecuted or puniſhed by death or corporall inflictions. This is now to be proved.

2. All the former diſcourſe is ſufficient argument how eaſie it *Numb. 3.* is for us in ſuch matters to be deceived. So long as Chriſtian Religion was a ſimple profeſſion of the articles of beliefe, and a hearty proſecution of the rules of good life, the fewneſſe of the articles and the clearneſſe of the rule, was cauſe of the ſeldome prevarication. But when divinity is ſwell'd up to ſo great a body, when the ſeverall queſtions which the peeviſhneſſe and wantonneſſe of ſixteene ages have commenc'd, are concentred into one, and from all theſe queſtions ſomething is drawne into the body of *Theologie* till it hath aſcended up to the greatneſſe of a mountaine, and the ſumme of Divinity collected by *Aquinas*, makes a volume as great as was that of *Livy* mock'd at in the *Epigramme*,

Quem

Quem mea vix totum bibliotheca capit.

It is impossible for any industry to consider so many particulars in the infinite numbers of questions as are necessary to be consider'd before we can with certainty determine any. And after all the considerations which we can have in a whole age, we are not sure *not to be deceived.* The obscurity of some questions, the nicety of some articles, the intricacy of some revelations, the variety of humane understandings, the windings of *Logicke*, the tricks of adversaries, the subtilty of Sophisters, the ingagement of educations, personall affections, the portentous number of writers, the infinity of authorities, the vastnesse of some arguments, as consisting in enumeration of many particulars, the uncertainty of others, the severall degrees of probability, the difficulties of Scripture, the invalidity of probation of tradition, the opposition of all exteriour arguments to each other, and their open contestation, the publicke violence done to authors and records, the private arts and supplantings, the falsifyings, the indefatigable industry of some men to abuse all understandings, and all perswasions into their owne opinions, these and thousands more, even all the difficulty of things, and all the weaknesses of man & all the arts of the Devill, have made it impossible for any man in so great variety of matter not to be deceived. No man pretends to it but the Pope, and no man is more deceived then he is in that very particular.

Numb. 4. 3. From hence proceeds a danger which is consequent to this proceeding, for if we, who are so apt to be deceived, & so insecure in our resolution of questions disputable, should persecute a dis-agreeing person, we are not sure we doe not fight against God, for if his proposition be true and persecuted, then, because all truth derives from God, this proceeding is against God, and therefore this is not to be done upon *Gamaliel's* ground, lest peradventure we be found to fight against God, of which because we can have no security (at least) in this case, we have all the guilt of a doubtfull or an uncertaine Conscience. For if there be no security in the thing as I have largely proved, the Conscience in such cases is as uncertaine as the question is, and if it be not doubtfull where it is uncertaine, it is because the man is not wise, but as confident as ignorant, the first without reason, and the second with-

without excuſe. And it is very diſproportionable for a man to perſecute another certainly, for a propoſition, that if he were wiſe, he would know is not certaine, at leaſt, the other perſon may innocently be uncertaine of it. If he be kill'd, he is certainly kill'd, but if he be call'd hereticke, it is not ſo certaine that he is an hereticke. It were good therefore, that proceedings were according to evidence, and the rivers not ſwell over the banks, nor a certaine definitive ſentence of death paſs'd upon ſuch perſwaſions which cannot certainly be defin'd. And this argument is of ſo much the more force, becauſe we ſee that the greateſt perſecutions that ever have been, were againſt truth, even againſt Chriſtianity it ſelfe, and it was a prediction of our bleſſed Saviour, that perſecution ſhould be the lot of true beleevers: and if we compute the experience of ſuffering Chriſtendome, and the prediction, that truth ſhould ſuffer, with thoſe few inſtances of ſuffering hereticks, it is odds, but perſecution is on the wrong ſide, and that it is errour and hereſie, that is, cruell and tyrannicall, eſpecially ſince the truth of Jeſus Chriſt, and of his Religion are ſo meeke, ſo charitable, and ſo mercifull: and we may in this caſe, exactly uſe the words of S. *Paul*, *But as then, he that was borne after the fleſh, perſecuted him that was borne after the ſpirit; even ſo it is now:* and ſo it ever will be till Chriſts ſecond coming. *Numb.* 5.

4. Whoever perſecutes a diſagreeing perſon, armes all the world againſt himſelfe, and all pious people of his owne perſwaſion, when the ſcales of authority return to his adverſary, and atteſt his contradictory; and then, what can he urge for mercy for himſelfe, or his party that ſheweth none to others? If he ſayes, that he is to be ſpared becauſe he beleeves true, but the other was juſtly perſecuted becauſe he was in errour, he is ridiculous. For he is as confidently beleeved to be a heretick, as he beleeves his adverſary ſuch, and whether he be or no, being the thing in queſtion, of this he is not to be his owne judge, but he that hath authority on his ſide, will be ſure to judge againſt him. So that, what either ſide can indifferently make uſe of, it is good that neither would, becauſe neither ſide can with reaſon ſufficient doe it in prejudice of the other. If a man will ſay, that every man muſt take his adventure, and if it happens authority to be with him,

Quo comperto illi in noſtram perniciem licentiore audacia graſſabuntur. S. Aug. epiſt. ad Dona. Proconſ. & Contr. ep. Fund. *ita nunc debeo ſuſtinere & tantâ patientiâ vobiſcum agere quantâ mecum egerunt proximi mei cum in veſtro dogmate rabioſum ac cæcum errarem.*

him, he will perſecute his adverſaries, and if it turnes againſt him he will bear it as well as he can, and hope for a reward of Martyrdome, and innocent ſuffering; beſides that this is ſo equall to be ſaid of all ſides, and beſides, that this is a way to make an eternall diſunion of hearts and charities, and that it will make Chriſtendome nothing but a ſhambles, and a perpetuall butchery, and as faſt as mens wits grow wanton, or confident, or proud, or abuſed, ſo often there will be new executions and maſſacres. Beſides all this, it is moſt unreaſonable and unjuſt, as being contrariant to thoſe Lawes of Juſtice and Charity, whereby we are bound with greater zeale to ſpare and preſerve an innocent, then to condemne a guilty perſon, and there's leſſe malice and iniquity in ſparing the guilty, then in condemning the good. Becauſe it is in the power of men to remit a guilty perſon to divine judicature, and for divers cauſes, not to uſe ſeverity, but in no caſe is it lawfull, neither hath God at all given to man a power to condemne ſuch perſons as cannot be proved other than pious and innocent. And therefore it is better, if it ſhould ſo happen, that we ſhould ſpare the innocent perſon, and one that is actually deceiv'd, then that upon the turn of the wheele, the true believers ſhould be deſtroyed.

Numb. 6. And this very reaſon, he that had authority ſufficient, and abſolute to make Lawes, was pleaſed to urge as a reaſonable inducement for the eſtabliſhing of that Law which he made for the indemnity of erring perſons. It was in the parable of the tares mingled with the good ſeed in *Agro dominico* the good ſeed (Chriſt himſelfe being the interpreter) are the Children of the Kingdome, the tares are the children of the wicked one, upon this comes the precept, *gather not the tares by themſelves, but let them both grow together till the harveſt*, that is, till the day of Judgement. This Parable hath been tortur'd infinitely to make it confeſſe its meaning, but we ſhall ſoone diſpatch it. All the difficulty and variety of expoſition is reducible to theſe two queſtions; What is meant by [*Gather not*,] and what by [*Tares*.] That is, what kind of ſword is forbidden, and what kind of perſons are to be tolerated. The former is cleare; for the ſpirituall ſword is not forbidden to be uſed to any ſort of criminals, for that would deſtroy the power of excommunication. The prohibition there-

therefore lyes againſt the uſe of the temporall ſword, in cutting off ſome perſons. Who they are, is the next difficulty. But by *tares*, or the *children of the wicked one*, are meant either perſons of ill lives, wicked perſons onely *in re practicâ*, or elſe another kind of evill perſons, men criminall or faulty *in re intellectuali*. One or other of theſe two muſt be meant; a third I know not. But the former cannot be meant, becauſe it would deſtroy all bodies politique, which cannot conſiſt without lawes, nor lawes without a compulſory and a power of the ſword, therefore if criminalls were to be let alone till the day of Judgement, bodies politique muſt ſtand or fall *ad arbitrium impiorum*, and nothing good could be protected, not Innocence it ſelfe, nothing could be ſecure but violence and tyrannie. It followes then that ſince a kind of perſons which are indeed faulty are to be tolerated, it muſt be meant of perſons faulty in another kind, in which the Goſpell had not in other places cleerely eſtabliſhed a power externally compulſory, and therefore ſince in all actions practically criminall a power of the ſword is permitted, here where it is denyed muſt meane a crime of another kind, and by conſequence errors intellectuall, commonly call'd hereſie.

Numb. 7.

And after all this the reaſon there given confirmes this * interpretation, for therefore it is forbidden to cut off theſe tares, leſt we alſo pull up the wheat with them, which is the ſumme of theſe two laſt arguments. For becauſe Hereſie is of ſo nice conſideration, and difficult ſentence, in thinking to root up hereſies, we may by our * miſtakes deſtroy true doctrine, which although it be poſſible to be done in all caſes of practicall queſtion, by miſtake, yet becauſe externall actions are more diſcernable then inward ſpeculations and opinions, innocent perſons are not ſo eaſily miſtaken for the guilty, in actions criminall, as in matters of inward perſwaſion. And upon that very reaſon Saint *Martin* was zealous to have procured a revocation of a Commiſſion granted to certaine Tribunes to make enquiry in *Spaine* for ſects and opinions; for under colour of rooting out the Priſcilianiſts, there was much miſchiefe done, and more likely to happen to the Orthodox. For it happened then, as oftentimes ſince, *Pallore potius & veſte quam fide hæreticus dijudicari ſolebat aliquando per Tribunos Maximi.* They were no good inquiſi-

* Vide S. Chryſoſt. homil. 47. in Cap. 13. Matth. et. S. Auguſt. Queſt. in cap. 13 Mat. S. Cyprian. Ep. lib. 3 Ep. 1. Theophyl. in 13. Matth.

* S. Hieron. in cap 13. Matth. ait, *per hanc parabolam ſignificari, ne in rebus dubijs præceps fiat judicium.*

tors of hereticall pravity, so *Sulpitius* witnesses. But secondly, the reason sayes, that therefore these persons are so to be permitted as not to be persecuted, lest when a revolution of humane affaires sets contrary opinions in the throne or chaire, they who were persecuted before, should now themselves become persecutors of others, and so at one time or other, before or after, the wheat be rooted up, and the truth be persecuted. But as these reasons confirme the Law, and this sense of it, so abstracting from the Law, it is of it selfe concluding by an argument *ab incommodo*, and that founded upon the principles of justice and right reason, as I formerly alledged.

Numb. 8.

* *Illi in vos sæviant qui nesciunt cum quo labore verum inveniatur, & quam difficilè cavendi sint errores. Illi in vos sæviant qui nesciunt quam rarum et arduum sit carnalia phantasmata piæ mentis serenitate superare. Illi in vos sæviant qui nesciunt quibus suspiriis & gemitibus fiat ut exquantulâcunque parte possit intelligi Deus. Postremo illi in vos sæviant qui nullo tali errore decepti sunt, quali vos deceptos vident.* S. August. Contr. Ep. Fund.

4. We are not onely uncertaine of finding out truths in matters disputable, but we are certaine that the best and ablest *Doctors of Christendome have been actually deceived in matters of great concernment, which thing is evident in all those instances of persons from whose doctrines all sorts of Christians respectively take liberty to dissent. The errors of *Papias*, *Irenæus*, *Lactantius*, *Justin Martyr* in the Millenary opinion, of Saint *Cyprian*, *Firmilian*, the Asian and African Fathers in the question of Re-baptization, Saint *Austin* in his decretory and uncharitable sentence against the unbaptized children of Christian parents, the Roman or the Greek Doctors in the question of the procession of the holy Ghost, and in the matter of images, are examples beyond exception. Ἀμφὶ δ' ἀνδρῶν φρένες Ἀμπλακίαι ἀνεύρηνται κέρμα τοι. Now if these great personages had been persecutedor destroyed for their opinions, who should have answered the invaluable losse the Church of God should have sustained in missing so excellent, so exemplary, and so great lights? But then if these persons erred, and by consequence, might have been destroyed, what should have become of others whose understanding was lower, and their security lesse, their errors more, and their danger greater? At this rate all men should have passed through the fire, for who can escape, when Saint *Cyprian* and Saint *Austin* cannot? Now to say these persons were not to be persecuted because although they had errors, yet none condemned by the Church, at that time or before, is to say nothing to the purpose, nor nothing that is true. Not true, because Saint *Cyprian* error was condemned by Pope *Stephen*, which in the present

sense

sense of the prevailing party in the Church of *Rome*, is to be condemned by the Church. Not to the purpose; because it is nothing else but to say that the Church did tolerate their errors. For since those opinions were open and manifest to the world, that the Church did not condemne them, it was either because those opinions were by the Church not thought to be errors, or if they were, yet she thought fit to tolerate the error and the erring person. And if she would doe so still, it would in most cases be better then now it is. And yet if the Church had condemned them, it had not altered the case as to this question, for either the persons upon the condemnation of their error should have been persecuted or not. If not, why shall they now, against the instance and precedent of those ages who were confessedly wise & pious, and whose practice are often made to us arguments to follow? If yea, and that they had been persecuted, it is the thing which this argument condemnes, and the losse of the Church had been invaluable in the losing or the provocation and temptation of such rare personages: and the example and the rule of so ill consequence, that all persons might upon the same ground have suffered, and though some had escaped, yet no man could have any more security from punishment then from error.

5. Either the disagreeing person is in error, or not, but a true believer; in either of the cases to persecute him is extremely imprudent. For if he be a true beleever, then it is a cleere case that we doe open violence to God, and his servants, and his truth. If he be in error, what greater folly and stupidity then to give to error the glory of Martyrdome, and the advantages which are accidentally consequent to a persecution? For as it was true of the Martyrs *Quoties morimur toties nascimur*, and the increase of their trouble was the increase of their confidence and the establishment of their perswasions: so it is in all false opinions; for that an opinion is true or false is extrinsecall or accidentall to the consequents and advantages it gets by being afflicted. And there is a popular pity that followes all persons in misery, and that compassion breeds likenesse of affections, and that very often produces likenesse of perswasion; and so much the rather, because there arises a jealousie and pregnant suspicion that they who per- *Numb. 9*

ſecute an opinion are deſtitute of ſufficient arguments to confute it, and that the hangman is the beſt diſputant. For if thoſe arguments which they have for their owne doctrine were a ſufficient ground of confidence & perſwaſion, men would be more willing to uſe thoſe means arguments which are better complyances with humane underſtanding, which more naturally doe ſatisfie it, which are more humane and Chriſtian, then that way which ſatisfies none, which deſtroyes many, which provokes more, which makes all men jealous. To which adde that thoſe who dye for their opinion, leave in all men, great arguments of the heartineſſe of their beliefe, of the confidence of their perſwaſion, of the piety and innocencie of their perſons, of the purity of their intention and ſimplicity of purpoſes; that they are perſons totally diſintereſt, and ſeparate from deſigne. For no intereſt can be ſo great as to be put in balance againſt a mans life and his ſoul, & he does very imprudently ſerve his ends who ſeeingly & fore-knowingly loſes his life in the proſecution of them. Juſt as if *Titius* ſhould offer to dye for *Sempronius* upon condition he might receive twenty talents when he had done his work. It is certainly an argument of a great love, and a great confidence, and a great ſincerity, and a great hope when a man layes downe his life in atteſtation of a propoſition. *Greater love then this hath no man, then to lay downe his life*, ſaith our Bleſſed Saviour. And although laying of a wager is an argument of confidence more then truth, yet laying ſuch a wager, ſtaking of a mans Soule, and pawning his life gives a hearty teſtimony that the perſon is honeſt, confident, reſigned, Charitable and Noble. And I know not whether truth can doe a perſon or a cauſe more advantages, then theſe can doe to an error. And therefore beſides the impiety, there is great imprudence in Canonizing a hereticke, and conſecrating an errour by ſuch meanes, which were better preſerv'd as incouragements of truth, and comforts to reall and true Martyrs. And it is not amiſſe to obſerve that this very advantage was taken by hereticks who were ready to ſhew and boaſt their Catalogues of Martyrs, in particular the *Circumcellians* did ſo, and the Donatiſts, and yet the firſt were heretickes, the ſecond Schiſmaticks. And it was remarkeable in the Schollers of *Priſcillian*, who, as they had their Maſter in the reputation of a Saint while he was living, ſo when he

he was dead, they had him in veneration as a Martyr; they with reverence and devotion carryed his, and the bodies of his ſlaine companions to an honourable ſepulture, and counted it Religion to ſweare by the name of *Priſcillian*. So that the extinguiſhing of the perſon, gives life and credit to his doctrine, and when he is dead he yet ſpeaks more effectually.

Numb. 10. 6. It is unnaturall and unreaſonable to perſecute diſagreeing opinions. Unnaturall; for Underſtanding being a thing wholly ſpirituall, cannot be reſtrained, and therefore neither puniſhed by corporall afflictions. It is in *alienâ republicâ*, a matter of another world; you may as well cure the colick by bruſhing a mans clothes, or fill a mans belly with a ſyllogiſme: theſe things doe not communicate in matter, and therefore neither in action nor paſſion; and ſince all puniſhments in a prudent government puniſh the offender to prevent a future crime, and ſo it proves more medicinall then vindictive, the punitive act being in order to the cure and prevention: and ſince no puniſhment of the body can cure a diſeaſe in the ſoule, it is diſproportionable in nature, and in all civill government, to puniſh where the puniſhment can doe no good. It may be an act of tyrannie, but never of juſtice. For is an opinion ever the more true or falſe for being perſecuted? Some men have beleeved it the more, as being provoked into a confidence, and vexed into a reſolution, but the thing it ſelfe is not the truer, and though the hangman may confute a man with an inexplicable dilemma, yet not convince his underſtanding, for ſuch premiſes can inferre no concluſion, but that of a mans life: and a Wolfe may as well give lawes to the underſtanding, as he whoſe dictates are onely propounded in violence, and writ in bloud. And a dog is as capable of a law as a man, if there be no choice in his obedience, nor diſcourſe in his choice, nor reaſon to ſatisfie his diſcourſe. And as it is unnaturall, ſo it is unreaſonable, that *Sempronius* ſhould force *Caius* to be of his opinion, becauſe *Sempronius* is Conſul this yeare, and commands the *Lictors*: As if he that can kill a man cannot but be infallible: and if he be not, why ſhould I doe violence to my conſcience, becauſe he can doe violence to my perſon?

Numb. 11. 7. Force in matters of opinion can doe no good, but is very apt

apt to doe hurt; for no man can change his opinion when he will, or be satisfied in his reason that his opinion is false, because discountenanced. If a man could change his opinion when he lists, he might cure many inconveniences of his life: all his feares and his sorrowes would soone disband, if he would but alter his opinion, whereby he is perswaded, that such an accident that afflicts him is an evill, and such an object formidable; let him but beleeve himselfe impregnable, or that he receives a benefit when he is plundered, disgraced, imprisoned, condemned, and afflicted, neither his sleeps need to be disturbed, nor his quietnesse discomposed. But if a man cannot change his opinion when he lists, nor ever does heartily or resolutely but when he cannot do otherwise, then to use force, may make him an hypocrite, but never to be a right beleever, and so instead of erecting a trophee to God and true Religion, we build a Monument for the Devill. Infinite examples are recorded in Church story to this very purpose: But *Socrates* instances in one for all; for when *Eleusius* Bishop of *Cyzicum* was threatned by the Emperour *Valens* with banishment and confiscation, if he did not subscribe to the decree of *Ariminum*, at last he yeilded to the *Arrian* opinion, and presently fell into great torment of Conscience, openly at *Cyzicum* recanted the errour, asked God and the Church forgivenesse, and complain'd of the Emperours injustice, and that was all the good the *Arrian* party got by offering violence to his Conscience. And so many families in Spain which are as they call them new Christians, and of a suspected faith, into which they were forc'd by the tyrannie of the Inquisition, and yet are secret Moores, is evidence enough, of the *inconvenience of preaching a doctrine *in ore gladii cruentandi*. For it either punishes a man for keeping a good conscience, or forces him into a bad; it either punishes sincerity, or perswades hypocrisie; it persecutes a truth, or drives into error: and it teaches a man to dissemble and to be safe, but never to be honest.

**Ejusmodi fuit Hipponensium conversio, cujus quidem speciei decepit Augustinum, ita ut opinaretur hæreticos licet non morte trucidandos vi tamen coercendos. Experientia enim demonstravit eos tam facile ad Arianismum transisse atq; ad Catholicismum, cum Arriani Principes rerum in ea civitate potirentur.*

8. It is one of the glories of Christian Religion, that it was so pious, excellent, miraculous and perswasive, that it came in upon its owne piety and wisdome, with no other force but a torrent of arguments and demonstration of the Spirit; a mighty rushing wind to beat downe all strong holds, and every high thought

Numb. 12.

and

and imagination; but towards the perſons of men it was alwayes full of meekneſſe and charity, complyance and toleration, condeſcenſion and bearing with one another, *reſtoring perſons overtaken with an error, in the ſpirit of meekneſſe, conſidering leſt we alſo be tempted.* The conſideration is as prudent, and the propoſition as juſt as the precept is charitable, and the precedent was pious and holy. Now things are beſt conſerved with that which gives it the firſt being, and which is agreeable to its temper and conſtitution. That precept which it chiefly preaches in order to all the bleſſedneſſe in the world, that is, of meekneſs, mercy and charity, ſhould alſo preſerve it ſelfe and promote its owne intereſt. For indeed nothing will doe it ſo well, nothing doth ſo excellently inſinuate it ſelfe into the underſtandings and affections of men, as when the actions and perſwaſions of a ſect, and every part and principle and promotion are univocall. And it would be a mighty diſparagement to ſo glorious an inſtitution, that in its principle it ſhould be mercifull and humane, and in the promotion and propagation of it ſo inhumane: And it would be improbable and unreaſonable that the ſword ſhould be uſed in the perſwaſion of one propoſition, and yet in the perſwaſion of the whole Religion nothing like it. To doe ſo, may ſerve the end of a temporall Prince, but never promote the honour of Chriſts Kingdome; it may ſecure a deſigne of *Spaine*, but will very much diſſerve Chriſtendome, to offer to ſupport it by that which good men believe to be a diſtinctive cogniſance of the Mahumetan Religion, from the excellencie and piety of Chriſtianity, whoſe ſenſe and ſpirit is deſcribed in thoſe excellent words of S. *Paul*, 2 *Tim.* 2. 24. *The ſervant of the Lord muſt not ſtrive, but be gentle unto all men, in meekneſſe inſtructing thoſe that oppoſe themſelves, if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging the truth.* They that oppoſe themſelves, muſt not be ſtrucken by any of Gods ſervants; and if yet any man will ſmite theſe who are his oppoſites in opinion, he will get nothing by that, he muſt quit the title of being a ſervant of God for his paines. And I think a diſtinction of perſons Secular and Eccleſiaſticall will doe no advantage for an eſcape, becauſe even the Secular power if it be Chriſtian, and a ſervant of God muſt not be πλήκτης. Δῆλον Κυρίῳ δεῖ μαχέσθαι, I meane in thoſe caſes where

meekneſſe of inſtruction is the remedy, or if the caſe be irremediable, abſciſſion by Cenſures is the penalty.

Numb. 13. 9. And if yet in the nature of the thing it were neither unjuſt nor unreaſonable, yet there is nothing under God Almighty that hath power over the ſoule of man, ſo as to command a perſwaſion, or to judge a diſagreeing: Humane poſitive Lawes direct all externall acts in order to ſeverall ends, and the Judges take cogniſance accordingly, but no man can command the will, or puniſh him, that obeys the Law againſt his will: for becauſe its end is ſerved in externall obedience, it neither looks after more, neither can it be ſerved by more, nor take notice of any more. And yet poſſibly the underſtanding is leſſe ſubject to humane power then the will, for that humane power hath a command over externall acts which naturally and regularly flow from the will, *& ut plurimùm* ſuppoſe a direct act of will, but alwayes either a direct or indirect volition, primary or accidentall; but the underſtanding is a naturall faculty ſubject to no command, but where the command is it ſelfe a reaſon fit to ſatisfie and perſwade it. And therefore God commanding us to beleeve ſuch revelations, perſwades and ſatisfies the underſtanding, by his commanding and revealing: for there is no greater probation in the world that a propoſition is true, then becauſe God hath commanded us to believe it. But becauſe no mans command is a ſatisfaction to the underſtanding, or a verification of the propoſition, therefore the underſtanding is not ſubject to humane authority. They may perſwade, but not enjoyne where God hath not; and where God hath, if it appeares ſo to him, he is an Infidell if he does not beleeve it. And if all men have no other efficacie or authority on the underſtanding but by perſwaſion, propoſall and intreaty, then a man is bound to aſſent but according to the operation of the argument, and the energie of perſwaſion, neither indeed can he, though he would never ſo faine, and he that out of feare and too much complyance and deſire to be ſafe, ſhall deſire to bring his underſtanding with ſome luxation to the beliefe of humane dictates and authorities, may as often miſſe of the truth as hit it, but is ſure alwaies to loſe the comfort of truth, becauſe he beleeves it upon indirect, inſufficient, and incompetent arguments: and as his deſire it ſhould be ſo is his beſt argument that it is ſo, ſo the pleaſing

pleaſing of men is his beſt reward; and his not being condemned and contradicted all the poſſeſſion of a truth.

SECT. XIIII.

Of the practice of Chriſtian Churches towards perſons diſagreeing, and when perſecution firſt came in.

And thus this truth hath been practiced in all times of Chriſtian Religion, when there were no collaterall deſignes on foot, nor intereſts to be ſerved, nor paſſions to be ſatisfied. In S. *Pauls* time, though the cenſure of hereſie were not ſo looſe and forward as afterwards, and all that were called Heretiques were cleerly ſuch, and highly criminall; yet as their crime was, ſo was their cenſure, that is, ſpirituall. They were firſt admoniſhed, once at leaſt, for ſo (a) *Irenæus*, (b) *Tertullian*, (c) *Cyprian*, (d) *Ambroſe*, and (e) *Hierome* read that place of *Titus* 3. But ſince that time all men, and at that time ſome read it, *Poſt unam & alteram admonitionem*, reject a Heretique. Rejection from the communion of Saints after two warnings, that's the penalty. Saint *John* expreſſes it by not *eating* with them, not bidding them *God ſpeed*, but the perſons againſt whom he decrees ſo ſeverely, are ſuch as denyed Chriſt to be come in the fleſh, direct Antichriſts: and let the ſentence be as high as it liſts in this caſe, all that I obſerve is, that ſince in ſo damnable doctrines nothing but ſpirituall cenſure, ſeparation from the communion of the faithfull was enjoyned and preſcribed, we cannot pretend to an Apoſtolicall precedent, if in matters of diſpute and innocent queſtion, and of great uncertainty and no malignity we ſhould proceed to ſentence of death.

(a) *l.* 3. *cap.* 3.
(b) *de præſcript.*
(c) *lib. ad Quirinum.*
(d) *in hunc locum.*
(e) *ibidem.*

For it is but an abſurd and illiterate arguing, to ſay that excommunication is a greater puniſhment, and killing, a leſſe; and therefore whoever may be excommunicated may alſo be put to death (which indeed is the reaſoning that *Bellarmine* uſes) for firſt, excommunication is not directly, and of it ſelf a greater puniſhment then corporall death. Becauſe it is indefinite, and incompleat, and in order to a further puniſhment, which if it happens, then the excommunication was the inlet to it, if it does not, the excom- *Numb.* 2.

munication did not ſignifie halfe ſo much as the loſſe of a member, much leſſe, death. For it may be totally ineffectuall, either by the iniquity of the proceeding, or repentance of the perſon: and in all times and caſes it is a medicine if the man pleaſe; if he will not, but perſeveres in his impiety, then it is himſelfe that brings the Cenſure to effect, that actuates the judgement and gives a ſting, and an energy upon that which otherwiſe would be χειρ ἄνυρ&. Secondly, but when it is at worſt, it does not kill the Soule, it onely conſignes it to that death which it had deſerved, and ſhould have received independently from that ſentence of the Church. Thirdly, and yet excommunication is to admirable purpoſe; for whether it referres to the perſon cenſured or to others, it is prudentiall in it ſelfe, it is exemplary to others, it is medicinall to all. For the perſon cenſured, is by this meanes threatned into piety, and the threatning made the more energeticall upon him becauſe by fiction of Law, or as it were by a Sacramentall repreſentment the paines of hell are made preſentiall to him; and ſo becomes an act of prudent judicature, and excellent diſcipline, and the beſt inſtrument of ſpirituall Government: Becauſe the neerer the threatning is reduced to matter, & the more preſent and circumſtantionable it is made, the more operative it is upon our ſpirits while they are immerged in matter. And this is the full ſenſe and power of excommunication in its direct intention: conſequently and accidentally other evills might follow it, as in the times of the Apoſtles, the cenſured perſons were buffeted by Satan, and even at this day there is leſſe ſecurity even to the temporall condition of ſuch a perſon whom his ſpirituall parents have Anathematiz'd. But beſides this, I know no warrant to affirme any thing of excommunication, for the ſentence of the Church does but declare, not effect the finall ſentence of damnation. Whoever deſerves excommunication deſerves damnation; and he that repents ſhall be ſaved, though he dye out of the Churches externall Communion, and if he does not repent, he ſhall be damn'd though he was not excommunicate.

Numb. 3. But ſuppoſe it greater then the ſentence of corporall death, yet it followes not, becauſe hereticks may be excommunicate, therefore kill'd, for from a greater to a leſſe, in a ſeverall kind of things the argument concludes not. It is a greater thing to make an excellent

cellent discourse then to make a shooe, yet he that can doe the greater cannot doe this lesse. An Angell cannot beget a man, & yet he can doe a greater matter in that kind of operations which we terme spirituall and Angelicall. And if this were concluding that whoever may be excommunicate may be kill'd, then, because of excommunications the Church is confessed the sole and intire Judge, she is also an absolute disposer of the lives of persons. I beleeve this will be but ill doctrine in *Spaine*: for in *Bullâ Cœnæ Domini* the King of *Spaine* is every year excommunicated on Maunday Thursday; but if by the same power he might also be put to death (as upon this ground he may) the Pope might with more ease be invested in that part of S. *Peters* patrimony which that King hath invaded and surpriz'd. But besides this, it were extreme harsh Doctrine in a Roman Consistory, from whence excommunications issue for trifles, for fees, for not suffering themselves infinitely to be oppressed, for any thing; if this be greater then death, how great a tyrannie is that which does more then kill men for less then trifles, or else how inconsequent is that argument which concludes its purpose upon so false pretence & supposition?

Well, however zealous the Apostles were against hereticks, yet none were by them, or their dictates put to death. The death of *Ananias* and *Saphira*, and the blindnesse of *Elymas* the Sorcerer amount not to this, for they were miraculous inflictions: and the first was a punishment to Vow-breach and Sacriledge, the second of Sorcery, and open contestation against the Religion of Jesus Christ; neither of them concerned the case of this present question: or if the case were the same, yet the authority is not the same: For he that inflicted these punishments was infallible, and of a power competent: But no man at this day is so. But as yet, people were converted by Miracles, & Preaching, and Disputing, and Hereticks by the same meanes were redargued, and all men instructed, none tortured for their opinion. And this continued till Christian people were vexed by disagreeing persons, and were impatient and peevish, by their owne too much confidence and the luxuriancy of a prosperous fortune: but then they would not endure persons that did dogmatize any thing which might intrench upon their reputation or their interest. And it is observable that no man, nor no age did ever teach the lawfullnesse of *Numb.* 4.

putting hereticks to death, till they grew wanton with proſperity. But when the reputation of the Governours was concerned, when the intereſts of men were indangered, when they had ſomething to loſe, when they had built their eſtimation upon the credit of diſputable queſtions, when they began to be jealous of other men, when they over-valued themſelves and their owne opinions, when ſome perſons invaded Biſhopricks upon pretence of new opinions, then they as they thrived in the favour of Emperours, and in the ſucceſſe of their diſputes, ſollicited the temporall power to baniſh, to fine, to impriſon, and to kill their adverſaries.

Numb. 5. So that the caſe ſtands thus. In the beſt times, amongſt the beſt men, when there were fewer temporall ends to be ſerved, when Religion and the pure and ſimple deſignes of Chriſtianity were onely to be promoted; in thoſe times and amongſt ſuch men, no perſecution was actuall, nor perſwaded nor allowed towards diſagreeing perſons. But as men had ends of their owne and not of Chriſts, as they receded from their duty, and Religion from its purity, as Chriſt anity began to be compounded with intereſts, and blended with temporall deſignes, ſo men were perſecuted for their opinions. This is moſt apparent, if we conſider when perſecution firſt came in, and if we obſerve how it was checked by the holieſt and the wiſeſt perſons.

Numb. 6. The firſt great inſtance I ſhall note was in *Priſcillian* and his followers, who were condemned to death by the Tyrant *Maximus*. Which inſtance although S. *Hierom* obſerves as a puniſhment, and judgement for the crime of hereſie, yet is of no uſe in the preſent queſtion, becauſe *Maximus* put ſome Chriſtians of all ſorts to death promiſcuouſly, Catholike and Heretick without choyce, and therefore the Priſcilianiſts might as well have called it a judgement upon the Catholiques, as the Catholiques upon them.

Numb. 7. But when *Urſatus* and *Stacius*, two Biſhops, procured the Priſcilianiſts death by the power they had at Court: S. *Martin* was ſo angry at them for their cruelty, that he excommunicated them both. And S. *Ambroſe* upon the ſame ſtock denyed his communion to the *Itaciani*. And the account that *Sulpitius* gives of the ſtory is this, *Hoc modo* (ſayes he) *homines luce indigniſſimi peſſimo exemplo necati ſunt*. The example was worſe then the men. If the men were hereticall, the execution of them however was unchriſtian.

But

But it was of more authority that the Nicene Fathers ſuppli-
cated the Emperour, and prevailed for the baniſhment of *Arius*,
of this we can give no other account, but that by the hiſtorie of
the time we ſee baſeneſſe enough, and perſonall miſdemeanour,
and factiouſneſſe of ſpirit in *Arius*, to have deſerved worſe then
baniſhment, though the obliquity of his opinion were not put
into the ballance; which we have reaſon to beleeve was not ſo
much as conſidered, becauſe *Conſtantine* gave toleration to diffe-
ring opinions, and *Arius* himſelfe was reſtored upon ſuch conditi-
ons to his country and office, which would not ſtand with the
ends of the Catholiques, if they had been ſevere exactors of con-
currence and union of perſwaſions.

I am ſtill within the ſcene of Eccleſiaſticall perſons, and am
conſidering what the opinion of the learnedeſt and the holieſt
prelates were concerning this great queſtion. If we will beleeve
Saint *Auſtin* (who was a credible perſon) no good man did al-
low it. *Nullis tamen bonis in Catholicâ hoc placet, ſi uſq; ad mor-
tem in quenquam licet hæreticum ſæviatur.* This was S. *Auſtins*
firſt opinion; For he had firſt been of the mind that it was not
honeſt to doe any violence to miſ-perſwaded perſons; and when
upon an accident happening in *Hippo* he had altered and retracted
that part of the opinion,, yet then alſo he excepted death, and
would by no means have any meere opinion made capitall. But
for ought appears, S. *Auſtin* had greater reaſon to have retracted
that retractation, then his firſt opinion. For his ſaying of *nullis bo-
nis placet* was as true as the thing was reaſonable it ſhould be ſo.
Witnes thoſe known teſtimonies of (a) *Tertullian*, (b) *Cyprian*,
(c) *Lactantius*, (d) *Hierom*, (e) *Severus Sulpitius*, (f) *Minutius*,
(g) *Hilary*, (h) *Damaſcen*, (i) *Chryſoſtome*, (k) *Theophylact*, and
(l) *Bernard*, and divers others, whom the Reader may find
quoted by the Arch-Biſhop of *Spalata*, *Lib.* 8. *de rep. Eccleſ.*
cap. 8.

Againſt this concurrent teſtimony my reading can furniſh me
with no adverſarie, nor contrary inſtances, but in *Attius* of *C.P.*
Theodoſius of *Synada*, in *Stacius* & *Urſeus* before reckoned. On-
ly indeed ſome of the later Popes of *Rome* began to be buſie and
unmercifull, but it was then when themſelves were ſecure, and
their intereſts great, and their temporall concernments highly
conſiderable.

Numb. 8. *Sozom. l.* 1. *c.* 20

Socrat. l. 1. *c.* 26 *Cont. Creſcon. Grammat. lib.* 3. *c.* 50. *vide etiam Epiſt.* 61. *ad dulcitium. et Epiſt.* 158. *et* 159. *et lib.* 1. *c.* 29. *cont. lit. petilian. vide etiam Socrat. li.* 3. *c.* 3. *et c.* 29.

Lib. 2. *cap.* 5. *retractat. vide Epiſt.* 48. *ad vincent. ſcripe. poſt. retract. et Epiſt.* 50. *ad Bonifac.*

(a) *ad Scapulâ.*
(b) *lib.* 3. *Ep.* 1. *Epiſt.*
(c) *Lib.* 5. *c.* 20.
(d) in cap 13. Matth. et in cap. 2. *hoſ.*
(e) in vit: S. Martin.
(f) Octav.
(g) cont. Auxent. Arr.
(h) 3. ſect: C. 32.
(i) in cap. 13. Matth. hom: 47.
(k) in cuang. Matth.
(l) in verba Apoſt. fides ex auditu.

For

Numb. 11. For it is moſt true, and not amiſſe to obſerve it, that no man who was under the ferula did ever think it lawfull to have opinions forced, or heretiques put to death, and yet many men who themſelves have eſcaped the danger of a pile and a faggot, have changed their opinion juſt as the caſe was altered, that is, as themſelves were unconcern'd in the ſuffering. *Petilian*, *Parmenian*, and *Gaudentius*, by no means would allow it lawfull, for themſelves were in danger, and were upon that ſide that is ill thought of and diſcountenanc'd: but * *Gregory* and * *Leo*, Popes of *Rome*, upon whoſe ſide the authority and advantages were, thought it lawfull they ſhould be puniſhed and perſecuted, for themſelves were unconcerned in the danger of ſuffering. And therefore S. *Gregory* commends the Exarch of *Ravenna*, for forcing them who diſſented from thoſe men who called themſelves the Church. And there were ſome Divines in the Lower *Germany*, who upon great reaſons ſpake againſt the tyrannie of the Inquiſition, and reſtraining Propheſying, who yet when they had ſhaked off the Spaniſh yoke, began to perſecute their Brethren. It was unjuſt in them, in all men unreaſonable and uncharitable, and often increaſes the error, but never leſſens the danger.

Apud Aug li. 1. c. 7. cont. Epiſt. Parmenian. & l. 2. c. 13. cont. lit. Petilian.

* *Epiſt. 1. ad Tubium.*

* *Lib. 1. ep. 72.*

Numb. 12. But yet although the Church, I mean, in her diſtinct & Clericall capacity, was againſt deſtroying or puniſhing difference in opinion, till the Popes of Rome did ſuper-ſeminate and perſwade the contrary, yet the Biſhops did perſwade the Emperours to make Lawes againſt Heretiques, and to puniſh diſobedient perſons with fines, with impriſonment, with death and baniſhment reſpectively. This indeed calls us to a new account. For the Church-men might not proceed to bloud nor corporall inflictions, but might they not deliver over to the Secular arme, and perſwade Temporall Princes to doe it? For this, I am to ſay, that ſince it is notorious that the doctrine of the Clergie was againſt puniſhing Heretiques, the Lawes which were made by the Emperours againſt them might be for reſtraint of differing Religion in order to the preſervation of the publique peace, which is too frequently violated by the diviſion of opinions. But I am not certaine whether that was alwayes the reaſon, or whether or no ſome Biſhops of the Court did not alſo ſerve their owne ends in giving their Princes ſuch untoward counſell; but we find the Lawes made ſeverally

to

to ſeverall purpoſes, in divers caſes and with different ſeverity. *Conſtantine* the Emperour made a Sanction, *Ut parem cum fidelibus ii qui errant pacis & quietis fruitionem gaudentes accipiant.* The Emperour *Gratian* decreed, *Ut quam quiſq; vellet religionem ſequeretur; & conventus Eccleſiaſticos ſemoto metu omnes agerent.* But he excepted the Manichees, the Photinians, and Eunomians. *Theodoſius* the elder made a law of death againſt the Anabaptiſts of his time, and baniſh'd *Eunomius*, and againſt other erring perſons appointed a pecuniary mulct; but he did no executions ſo ſevere as his ſanctions, to ſhew they were made *in terrorem* onely. So were the Lawes of *Valentinian* and *Martian*, decreeing *contra omnes qui prava docere tenent*, that they ſhould be put to death; ſo did * *Michael* the Emperour, but *Juſtinian* onely decreed baniſhment.

Apud Euſeb. de vita Conſtant.

vide Socrat. l. 7. c. 12.

Vid. Cod. de hereticis. L. manichees. & leg. Arriani, & l. Quicunque.

* *Apud Paulum Diac. l. 16. & l. 24. Numb.* 11.

But what ever whiſpers ſome Politiques might make to their Princes, as the wiſeſt & holieſt did not think it lawful for Churchmen alone to doe executions, ſo neither did they tranſmit ſuch perſons to the Secular Judicature. And therefore when the Edict of *Macedonius* the Preſident was ſo ambiguous, that it ſeemed to threaten death to Heretiques, unleſſe they recanted; S. *Auſtin* admoniſhed him carefully to provide that no Heretique ſhould be put to death, alledging it alſo not onely to be unchriſtian, but illegall alſo, and not warranted by imperiall conſtitutions; for before his time no Lawes were made for their being put to death: but however he prevailed, that *Macedonius* publiſhed another Edict, more explicite, and leſſe ſeemingly ſevere. But in his Epiſtle to *Donatus*, the African Proconſul, he is more confident and determinate, *Neceſſitate nobis impactâ & indictâ, ut potiùs occidi ab eis eligamus, quàm eos occidendos veſtris judiciis ingeramus.*

But afterwards many got a trick of giving them over to the Secular power, which at the beſt is no better then hypocriſie, removing envie from themſelves, and laying it upon others, a refuſing to doe that in externall act, which they doe in councell and approbation: which is a tranſmitting the act to another, and retaining a proportion of guilt unto themſelves, even their own and the others too. I end this with the ſaying of *Chryſoſtome*, *Dogmata*

Numb. 12.

Serm. de Anathemate.

mata impia & quæ ab hæreticis profecta ſunt arguere & anathematizare oportet, hominibus autem parcendum & pro ſalute eorum orandum.

SECT. XV.

How farre the Church or Governours may act to the reſtraining falſe or differing opinions.

BUt although Hereticall perſons are not to be deſtroyed, yet hereſy being a work of the fleſh, and all hereticks criminall perſons, whoſe acts and doctrine have influence upon Communities of men whether Eccleſiaſticall or civill, the governours of the Republique, or Church reſpectively are to do their duties in reſtraining thoſe miſchiefes which may happen to their ſeverall charges, for whoſe indemnity they are anſwerable. And therefore according to the effect or malice of the doctrine or the perſon, ſo the cogniſance of them belongs to ſeverall judicatures. If it be falſe doctrine in any capacity and doth miſchiefe in any ſenſe, or teaches ill life in any inſtance, or incourages evill in any particular, δεῖ ἐλεγχθῆναι, theſe men muſt be ſilenced, they muſt be convinced by ſound doctrine, and put to ſilence by ſpirituall evidence, and reſtrained by authority Eccleſiaſticall, that is, by ſpirituall cenſures according as it ſeemes neceſſary to him who is moſt concern'd in the regiment of the Church. For all this we have precept and precedent Apoſtolicall, and much reaſon. For by thus doing, the governour of the Church uſes all that authority that is competent, and all the meanes that is reaſonable, and that proceeding which is regular, that he may diſcharge his cure and ſecure his flock. And that he poſſibly may be deceived in judging a doctrine to be hereticall, and by conſequence the perſon excommunicate ſuffers injury, is no argument againſt the reaſonableneſſe of the proceeding. For all the injury that is, is viſible and in appearance, and ſo is his crime. Iudges muſt judge according to their beſt reaſon guided by law of God as their rule, and by evidence and appearance as their beſt inſtrument, and they can judge no better

better. If the Judges be good and prudent, the error of proceeding will not be great, nor ordinary, and there can be no better eſtabliſhment of humane judicature, then is a fallible proceeding upon an infallible ground; And if the judgement of hereſie be made by eſtimate and proportion of the opinion to a good or a bad life reſpectively, ſuppoſing an error in the deduction, there will be no malice in the concluſion; and that he endeavours to ſecure piety according to the beſt of his underſtanding, and yet did miſtake in his proceeding, is onely an argument that he did his duty after the manner of men, poſſibly with the piety of a Saint, though not with the underſtanding of an Angel. And the little inconvenience that happens to the perſon injuriouſly judged is abundantly made up in the excellency of the Diſcipline, the goodneſſe of the example, the care of the publike, and all thoſe great influences into the manners of men which derive from ſuch an act ſo publiquely conſign'd. But ſuch publique judgement in matters of opinion muſt be ſeldome and curious, and never but to ſecure piety, and a holy life; for in matters ſpeculative, as all determinations are fallible, ſo ſcarce any of them are to purpoſe, nor ever able to make compenſation of either ſide, either for the publike fraction, or the particular injuſtice if it ſhould ſo happen in the cenſure.

But then as the Church may proceed thus far, yet no Chriſtian man, or Community of men may proceed farther. For if they be deceived in their judgement and cenſure, and yet have paſſed onely ſpirituall cenſures, they are totally ineffectuall, and come to nothing, there is no effect remaining upon the ſoule, and ſuch cenſures are not to meddle with the body ſo much as indirectly. But if any other judgement paſſe upon perſons erring, ſuch judgements whoſe effects remaine, if the perſon be unjuſtly cenſured, nothing will anſwer and make compenſation for ſuch injuries. If a perſon be excommunicate unjuſtly, it will doe him no hurt, but if he be killed or diſmembred unjuſtly, that cenſure and infliction is not made ineffectuall by his innocence, he is certainly kill'd and diſmembred. So that as the Churches authority in ſuch caſes ſo reſtrained and made prudent, cautelous, and orderly, is juſt and competent: ſo the proceeding is reaſonable, it is pro- *Numb.* 2.

vident for the publike, and the inconveniences that may fall upon particulars ſo little, as that the publique benefit makes ample compenſation, ſo long as the proceeding is but ſpirituall.

Numb. 3. This diſcourſe is in the caſe of ſuch opinions, which by the former rules are formall hereſies, and upon practicall inconveniences. But for matters of queſtion which have not in them an enmity to the publique tranquillity, as the Republique hath nothing to doe, upon the ground of all the former diſcourſes; ſo if the Church meddles with them where they doe not derive into ill life, either in the perſon or in the conſequent, or elſe are deſtructions of the foundation of Religion, which is all one, for that thoſe fundamentall articles are of greateſt neceſſity in order to a vertuous and godly life, which is wholly built upon them, (and therefore are principally neceſſary) If ſhe meddles further, otherwiſe then by preaching, and conferring, and exhortation, ſhe becomes tyrannicall in her government, makes her ſelfe an immediate judge of conſciences and perſwaſions, lords it over their faith, deſtroyes unity, and charity; and as if he that dogmatizes the opinion becomes criminall, if he troubles the Church with an immodeſt, peeviſh, and pertinacious propoſall of his article, not ſimply neceſſary; ſo the Church does not doe her duty, if ſhe ſo condemnes it *pro tribunali* as to enjoyne him and all her ſubjects to beleeve the contrary. And as there may be pertinacy in doctrine, ſo there may be pertinacy in judging, and both are faults. The peace of the Church and the unity of her doctrine is beſt conſerved when it is judged by the proportion it hath to that rule of unity which the Apoſtles gave, that is the Creed for Articles of meer beliefe, and the precepts of Jeſus Chriſt, and the practicall rules of piety, which are moſt plaine and eaſie, and without controverſie, ſet downe in the Goſpels, and Writings of the Apoſtles. But to multiply articles, and adopt them into the family of the faith, and to require aſsent to ſuch articles which (as S. *Pauls* phraſe is) are of doubtfull diſputation, equall to that aſsent wee give to matters of faith, is to build a Tower upon the top of a Bulruſh, and the further the effect of ſuch proceedings does extend, the worſe they are; the very making ſuch

such a Law is unreasonable, the inflicting spirituall censures upon them that cannot doe so much violence to their understanding as to obey it, is unjust and ineffectuall; but to punish the person with death, or with corporall infliction, indeed it is effectuall, but it is therefore tyrannicall. We have seen what the Church may doe towards restraining false or differing opinions, next I shall consider by way of Corollarie what the Prince may doe as for his interest, and onely in securing his people, and serving the ends of true Religion.

SECT. XVI.

Whether it be lawfull for a Prince to give toleration to severall Religions.

FOr upon these very grounds we may easily give account of that great question, Whether it be lawfull for a Prince to give toleration to severall Religions. *Numb.* 1.

For first, it is a great fault that men will call the severall sects of Christians by the names of severall Religions. The Religion of JESUS CHRIST is the forme of sound doctrine and wholsome words, which is set downe in Scripture indefinitely, actually conveyed to us by plaine places, and separated as for the question of necessary or not necessary by the Symbol of the Apostles. Those impertinencies which the wantonness and vanity of men hath commenced, which their interests have promoted, which serve not truth so much as their own ends, are farre from being distinct Religions; for matters of opinion are no parts of the worship of God, nor in order to it, but as they promote obedience to his Commandments; and when they contribute towards it, are in that proportion as they contribute parts and actions, and minute particulars of that Religion to whose end they doe, or pretend to serve. And such are all the sects and all the pretences of Christians, but pieces and minutes of Christianity, if they doe serve the great end, as every man for his owne sect and interest beleeves for his share it does.

2. Tolleration hath a double ſenſe or purpoſe, for ſometimes by it men underſtand a publick licenee and exerciſe of a ſect: Sometimes it is onely an indemnity of the perſons privately to convene and to opine as they ſee cauſe, and as they meane to anſwer to God. Both theſe are very much to the ſame purpoſe, unleſſe ſome perſons whom we are bound to ſatisfie be ſcandaliz'd, and then the Prince is bound to doe as he is bound to ſatisfie. To God it is all one. For abſtracting from the offence of perſons, which is to be conſidered juſt as our obligation is to content the perſons, it is all one whether we indulge to them to meet publikely or privately, to do actions of Religion concerning which we are not perſwaded that they are truely holy. To God it is juſt one to be in the dark and in the light, the thing is the ſame, onely the Circumſtance of publick and private is different, which cannot be concerned in any thing, nor can it concerne any thing but the matter of Scandall and relation to the minds and fantaſies of certaine perſons.

Numb. 3. 3. So that to tolerate is not to perſecute. And the queſtion whether the Prince may tollerate divers perſwaſions, is no more then whether he may lawfully perſecute any man for not being of his opinion. Now in this caſe he is juſt ſo to tollerate diverſity of perſwaſions as he is to tolerate publike actions, for no opinion is judicable, nor no perſon puniſhable, but for a ſin, and if his opinion by reaſon of its managing, or its effect, be a ſinne in it ſelfe, or becomes a ſinne to the perſon, then as he is to doe towards other ſinnes, ſo to that opinion or man ſo opining. But to beleeve ſo, or not ſo, when there is no more but meere beleeving, is not in his power to enjoyne, therefore not to puniſh. And it is not onely lawfull to tollerate diſagreeing perſwaſions, but the authority of God onely is competent to take notice of it, and infallible to determine it, and fit to judge, and therefore no humane authority is ſufficient to doe all thoſe things which can juſtifie the inflicting temporall puniſhments upon ſuch as doe not conforme in their perſwaſions to a rule or authority which is not only fallible, but ſuppoſed by the diſagreeing perſon to be actually deceived.

Numb. 4. But I conſider that in the toleration of a different opinion, Re-

Religion is not properly and immediately concerned, so as in any degree to be endangered. For it may be safe in diversity of perswasions, and it also a part of Christian * Religion that the liberty of mens Consciences should be preserved in all things, where God hath not set a limit and made a restraint; that the soule of man should be free, and acknowledge no master but Jesus Christ; that matters spirituall should not be restrain'd by punishments corporall; that the same meekeneſse and charity should be preserved in the promotion of Christianity, that gave it foundation and increment, & firmneſs in its first publication; that conclusions should not be more dogmaticall then the vertuall resolution and efficacy of the premises: And that the persons should not more certainly be condemned then their opinions confuted; and lastly, that the infirmities of men and difficulties of things should be both put in ballance to make abatement in the definitive sentence against mens persons. But then because tolleration of opinions is not properly a question of Religion, it may be a question of policy: And although a man may be a good Christian, though he beleeve an errour not fundamentall, and not directly or evidently impious, yet his opinion may accidentally disturbe the publick peace through the over-activeneſse of the person, and the confidence of their beliefe and the opinion of its appendant necessity, and therefore tolleration of differing perswasions in these cases is to be considered upon politicall grounds, and is just so to be admitted or denyed as the opinions or tolleration of them may consist with the publicke and necessary ends of Government. Onely this: As Christian Princes must looke to the interest of their Government, so especially must they consider the interests of Christianity, & not call every redargution or modest discovery of an establiſhed errour, by the name of disturbance of the peace. For it is very likely that the peevishneſs and impatience of contradiction in the Governours may break the peace. Let them remember the gentleneſse of Christianity, the Liberty of Consciences which ought to be preserved, and let them doe justice to the persons, whoever they are that are peevish, provided no mans person be over-born with prejudice. For if it be necessary for all men to subscribe to the present establiſhed Religion, by the same reason

* *Humani juris & naturalis potestatis, unicuique quod putaverit, colere. Sed nec religionis est cogere religionem, quæ suscipi sponte debet, non vi.* Tertul. ad Scapulam.

at

at another time a man may be bound to ſubſcribe to the contradictory, and ſo to all Religions in the world. And they only, who by their too much confidence intitle God to all their fancies, and make them to be queſtions of Religion, and evidences for Heaven, or conſignations to Hell, they onely think this doctrine unreaſonable, and they are the men that firſt diſturb the Churches peace, and then thinke there is no appeaſing the tumult but by getting the victory. But they that conſider things wiſely, underſtand that ſince ſalvation and damnation depend not upon impertinencies, and yet that publick peace and tranquillity may, the Prince is in this caſe to ſeeke how to ſecure Government, and the iſſues and intentions of that, while there is in theſe caſes directly no inſecurity to Religion, unleſſe by the accidentall uncharitableneſſe of them that diſpute: Which uncharitableneſſe is alſo much prevented when the publikè peace is ſecured, and no perſon is on either ſide ingaged upon *revenge, or troubled with diſgrace, or vexed with puniſhments by any decretory ſentence againſt him. It was the ſaying of a wiſe ſtates-man (I meane *Thuanus*) *Hæretici qui pace data factionibus ſcinduntur, perſecutione uniuntur contra Remp.* If you perſecute heretickes or diſcrepants, they unite themſelves as to a common defence: If you permit them, they divide themſelves upon private intereſt, and the rather, if this intereſt was an ingredient of the opinion.

* *Dextera præcipuè capit indulgentia mentes.*

Aſperitas odii ſæva q; bella parit.

Numb. 5. The Summe is this, it concernes the duty of a Prince becauſe it concernes the Honour of God, that all vices and every part of ill life be diſcountenanced and reſtrain'd: And therefore in relation to that, opinions are to be dealt with. For the underſtanding being to direct the will, and opinions to guide our practices, they are conſiderable onely as they teach impiety and vice, as they either diſhonour God or diſobey him. Now all ſuch doctrines are to be condemned; but for the perſons preaching ſuch Doctrines, if they neither juſtifie nor approve the pretended Conſequences which are certainly impious, they are to be ſeparated from that conſideration. But if they know ſuch conſequences and allow them, or if they doe not ſtay till the doctrines produce impiety, but take ſinne before hand, and mannage them impiouſly in any ſenſe; or if either themſelves or their doctrine doe really and

and without colour or fained pretext, diſturb the publique peace * and juſt intereſts, they are not to be ſuffered. In all other caſes it is not onely lawfull to permit them, but it is alſo neceſsary, that Princes and all in authority ſhould not perſecute diſcrepant opinions. And in ſuch caſes wherein perſons not otherwiſe incompetent are bound to reprove an error, (as they are in many) in all theſe if the Prince makes reſtraint, he hinders men from doing their duty, and from obeying the Lawes of JESUS CHRIST.

* *Extat prudens monitum Mecænatis apud Dionem Caſſium ad Auguſtum in hæc verba. Eos vero qui in Divinis aliquid innovant, odio habe, & coerce, non Deorum ſolum cauſâ: ſed quia nova numina hi tales introducentes multos impellunt ad mutationem rerum. Unde conjurationes, ſeditiones, Conciliabula exiſtunt, res profectò minimè conducibiles principatui. Et legibus quoq; expreſſum eſt, quod in religionem committitur, in omnium fertur injuriam.*

SECT. XVII.

Of complyance with diſagreeing perſons or weake conſciences in generall.

VPon theſe grounds it remaines that we reduce this doctrine to practicall Concluſions, and conſider among the differing ſects and opinions which trouble theſe parts of Chriſtendome, and come into our concernment, which ſects of Chriſtians are to be tolerated, and how farre? and which are to be reſtrained and puniſhed in their ſeverall proportions? *Numb.* 1.

The firſt conſideration is, that ſince diverſity of opinions does more concerne publike peace then religion, what is to be done to perſons who diſobey a publike ſanction upon a true allegation; that they cannot believe it to be lawfull to obey ſuch conſtitutions, although they diſ-believe them upon inſufficient grounds, that is, whether in *conſtituta lege* diſagreeing perſons or weake conſciences are to be complyed withall, and their diſobeying and diſagreeing tolerated? *Numb.* 2.

1. In this queſtion there is no diſtinction can be made between *Numb.* 3.

persons truely weake, and but pretending so. For all that pretend to it, are to be allowed the same liberty whatsoever it be; for no mans spirit is knowne to any, but to God and himselfe: and therefore pretences and realityes in this case, are both alike in order to the publike toleration. And this very thing is one argument to perswade a Negative. For the chiefe thing in this case is the concernment of publique government, which is then most of all violated, when what may prudently be permitted to some purposes, may be demanded to many more, and the piety of the Lawes abused to the impiety of other mens ends. And if laws be made so malleable, as to comply with weak consciences, he that hath a mind to disobey, is made impregnable against the coercitive power of the Law by this pretence. For a weak conscience signifyes nothing in this case, but a dislike of the Law upon a contrary perswasion. For if some weak consciences doe obey the law, and others doe not, it is not their weakness indefinitely that is the cause of it, but a definite and particular perswasion to the contrary. So that if such a pretence be excuse sufficient from obeying, then the law is a sanction obliging every one to obey that hath a mind to it, and he that hath not, may choose, that is, it is no Law at all, for he that hath a mind to it may doe it if there be no Law, and he that hath no mind to it need not for all the Law.

Numb. 4. And therefore the wit of man cannot prudently frame a law of that temper, and expedient, but either he must lose the formality of a law, and neither have power coercitive nor obligatory, but *ad arbitrium inferiorum*, or else it cannot antecedently to the particular case give leave to any sort of men to disagree or disobey.

Numb. 5. 2. Suppose that a Law be made with great reason so as to satisfie divers persons pious & prudent, that it complyes with the necessity of government, and promotes the intereſt of Gods service and publike order, it may easily be imagined that these persons which are obedient sons of the Church, may be as zealous for the publike order and discipline of the Church, as others for their opinion against it, and may be as much scandalized at disobedience

bedience be tolerated, as others are if the Law be exacted, and what ſhall be done in this caſe? Both ſorts of men cannot be complyed withall, becauſe as theſe pretend to be offended at the Law, and by conſequence (if they underſtand the conſequents of their owne opinion) at them that obey the Law: ſo the others are juſtly offended at them that unjuſtly diſobey it. If therefore there be any on the right ſide as confident and zealous as they who are on the wrong ſide, then the diſagreeing perſons are not to be complyed with, to avoid giving offence; for if they be, offence is given to better perſons, and ſo the miſchiefe, which ſuch complying ſeeks to prevent, is made greater and more unjuſt, obedience is diſcouraged, and diſobedience is legally canonized for the reſult of a holy and a tender conſcience.

3. Such complying with the diſagreeings of a ſort of men, is the totall overthrow of all Diſcipline, and it is better to make no Lawes of publique worſhip, then to reſcind them in the very conſtitution: and there can be no end in making the ſanction, but to make the Law ridiculous, and the authority contemptible. For to ſay that complying with weake conſciences in the very framing of a Law of Diſcipline, is the way to preſerve unity, were all one as to ſay, To take away all Lawes is the beſt way to prevent diſobedience. In ſuch matters of indifferencie, the beſt way of cementing the fraction, is to unite the parts in the authority, for then the queſtion is but one, *viz.* Whether the authority muſt be obeyed or not? But if a permiſſion be given of diſputing the particulars, the queſtions become next to infinite. A Mirrour when it is broken repreſents the object multiplyed and divided: but if it be entire and through one centre tranſmits the ſpecies to the eye, the Viſion is one and naturall. Lawes are the Mirrour in which men are to dreſſe and compoſe their actions, and therefore muſt not be broken with ſuch clauſes of exception which may without remedy be abuſed to the prejudice of authority, and peace, and all humane ſanctions. And I have knowne in ſome Churches that this pretence hath been nothing but a deſigne to diſcredit the Law, to diſmantle the authority that made it, to *Numb. 6.*

raiſe their owne credit, and a trophey of their zeale, to make it a characteriſtick note of a ſect, and the cogniſance of holy perſons, and yet the men that claim'd exemption from the Lawes, upon pretence of having weake conſciences, if in hearty expreſſion you had told them ſo to their heads, they would have ſpit in your face, and were ſo farre from confeſſing themſelves weake, that they thought themſelves able to give Lawes to Chriſtendome, to inſtruct the greateſt Clerks, and to Catechize the Church her ſelfe; And which is the worſt of all, they who were perpetually clamorous that the ſeverity of the Lawes ſhould ſlacken as to their particular, and in matter adiaphorous (in which, if the Church hath any authority, ſhe hath power to make Lawes) to indulge a leave to them to doe as they liſt, yet were the moſt imperious amongſt men, moſt decretory in their ſentences, and moſt impatient of any diſagreeing from them though in the leaſt minute and particular: whereas by all the juſtice of the world, they who perſwade ſuch a complyance in matters of fact, and of ſo little queſtion, ſhould not deny to tolerate perſons that differ in queſtions of great difficulty and conteſtation.

Numb. 7. 4. But yet ſince all things almoſt in the world have beene made matters of diſpute, and the will of ſome men, and the malice of others, and the infinite induſtry and pertinacie of conteſting and reſolution to conquer hath abuſed ſome perſons innocently into a perſwaſion, that even the Lawes themſelves, though never ſo prudently conſtituted, are ſuperſtitious or impious, ſuch perſons who are otherwiſe pious, humble and religious, are not to be deſtroyed for ſuch matters, which in themſelves are not of concernment to ſalvation, and neither are ſo accidentally to ſuch men and in ſuch caſes where they are innocently abuſed, and they erre without purpoſe and deſigne. And therefore if there be a publike diſpoſition in ſome perſons to diſlike Lawes of a certaine quality, if it be fore-ſeene it is to be conſidered *in lege dicendâ*; and whatever inconvenience or particular offence is fore-ſeene, is either to be directly avoided in the Law, or elſe a compenſation in the excellency of the

the Law, and certaine advantages, made to out-weigh their pretenſions: But *in lege jam dictâ*, becauſe there may be a neceſſity ſome perſons ſhould have a liberty indulged them, it is neceſſary that the Governours of the Church ſhould be intruſted with a power to conſider the particular caſe, and indulge a liberty to the perſon, and grant perſonall diſpenſations. This I ſay is to be done at ſeverall times, upon particular inſtance, upon ſingular conſideration, and new emergencies. But that a whole kind of men, ſuch a kind to which all men without poſſibility of being confuted may pretend, ſhould at once in the very frame of the Law be permitted to diſobey, is to nullifie the Law, to deſtroy Diſcipline, and to hallow diſobedience; it takes away the obliging part of the Law, and makes that the thing enacted ſhall not be enjoyn'd, but tolerated onely: it deſtroyes unity and uniformity, which to preſerve was the very end of ſuch lawes of Diſcipline: it bends the rule to the thing which is to be ruled, ſo that the law obeyes the ſubject, not the ſubject the law: it is to make a law for particulars, not upon generall reaſon and congruity, againſt the prudence and deſigne of all Lawes in the world, and abſolutely without the example of any Church in Chriſtendome; it prevents no ſcandall, for ſome will be ſcandalized at the authority it ſelfe, ſome at the complying, and remiſneſſe of Diſcipline, and ſeverall men at matters, and upon ends contradictory: All which cannot, ſome ought not to be complyed withall.

Numb. 8. 6. The ſumme is this. The end of the Lawes of Diſcipline are in an immediate order to the conſervation and ornament of the publique, and therefore the Lawes muſt not ſo tolerate, as by conſerving perſons to deſtroy themſelves and the publike benefit, but if there be cauſe for it, they muſt be caſſated, or if there be no ſufficient cauſe, the complyings muſt be ſo as may beſt preſerve the particulars in conjunction with the publike end, which becauſe it is primarily intended, is of greateſt conſideration. But the particulars whether of caſe or perſon are to be conſidered occaſionally and emergently by the Judges, but cannot antecedently and regularly be determined by a Law.

Numb. 9. But this sort of men is of so generall pretence, that all Lawes and all Judges may easily be abused by them. Those sects which are signified by a Name, which have a systeme of Articles, a body of profession, may be more cleerly determined in their question concerning the lawfulnesse of permitting their professions and assemblies.

I shall instance in two, which are most troublesome and most dislik'd; and by an account made of these, we may make judgement what may be done towards others whose errors are not apprehended of so great malignity. The men I meane are the Anabaptists and the Papists.

SECT.

SECT. 18.

A particular consideration of the opinions of the Anabaptists.

IN the Anabaptists I consider onely their two capitall opinions, the one against the baptisme of infants, the other against Magistracy: and because they produce different judgements and various effects, all their other fancyes which vary as the Moon does, may stand or fall in their proportion and likenesse to these. *Numb.* 1.

And first I consider their denying baptisme to infants; although it be a doctrine justly condemned by the most sorts of Christians, upon great grounds of reason, yet possibly their defence may be so great, as to take off much, and rebate the edge of their adversaries assault. It will be neither unpleasant nor unprofitable to draw a short scheme of plea for each party, the result of which possibly may be, that though they be deceived, yet they have so great excuse on their side, that their errour is not impudent or vincible. The baptisme of infants rests wholly upon this discourse. *Numb.* 2.

When God made a covenant with Abraham for himselfe and his posterity, into which the Gentiles were reckoned by spirituall adoption, he did for the present consigne that covenant with the Sacrament of circumcision. The extent of which rite, was to all his family, from the *Major domo*, to the *Proselytus domicilio*, and to infants of eight dayes old. Now the very nature of this covenant being a covenant of faith for its formallity, and with all faithfull people for the object; and circumcision being a seale of this covenant, if ever any rite doe supervene to consigne the same covenant, that rite must acknowledge circumcision for its type and precedent. And this the Apostle tels us in expresse doctrine. Now the nature of types, is to give some proportions to its successour the Antitype, and they both being seales of the same righteousnesse of faith, it will not easily be found where these two seales have any such distinction in their nature or purposes, as to appertaine to persons of differing capacity, and not equally concerne all, and this argument was thought of so much force by some of those excellent men which were Bishops in the primitive church, that a good Bishop writ an Epistle to *S. Cyprian*, to know *Numb.* 3.

know of him whether or no it were lawfull to baptize infants before the eighth day, because the type of baptisme was ministred in that circumcision, he in his discourse supposing that the first rite was a direction to the second, which prevailed with him so farre as to believe it to limit every circumstance.

Numb. 4. And not onely this type, but the acts of Christ which were previous to the institution of baptisme did prepare our understanding by such impresses as were sufficient to produce such perswasion in us, that Christ intended this ministery for the actuall advantage of infants as well as of persons of understanding. For Christ commanded that children should be brought unto him, he took them in his armes, he imposed hands on them and blessed them, and without question did by such acts of favour consigne his love to them, and them to a capacity of an eternall participation of it. And possibly the invitation which Christ made to all to come to him, all them that are heavy laden, did in its proportion concerne infants as much as others, if they be guilty of Originall sinne, and if that sinne be a burthen, and presses them to any spirituall danger or inconvenience. And it is all the reason of the world, that since the grace of Christ is as large as the prevarication of *Adam*, all they who are made guilty by the first *Adam*, should be cleansed by the second. But as they are guilty by another mans act, so they should be brought to the Font, to be purifyed by others, there being the same proportion of reason, that by others acts, they should be relieved who were in danger of perishing by the act of others. And therefore *S. Austin* argues excellently to this purpose. *Accommodat illis mater Ecclesia aliorum pedes, ut veniant; aliorum cor, ut credant; aliorum linguam, ut fateantur: ut quoniam quod ægri sunt, alio peccante prægravantur, sic cum sani fiant alio confitente salventur.* And *Iustin Martyr*, ἀξιοῦμαι ἢ τῶν διὰ τὸ βαπτίσματος ἀγαθῶν τὰ βρέφη τῇ πίστει τῶν προσφερόντων αὐλὰ τῷ βαπτίσματι.

Serm. 10. de verb. Apost.

Resp. ad Orthodoxos.

Numb. 5. But whether they have originall sinne or no, yet take them *in puris naturalibus*, they cannot goe to God, or attaine to eternity: to which they were intended in their first being and creation, and therefore much lesse since their naturals are impair'd by the curse on humane nature, procur'd by *Adams* prevarication. And if a naturall agent cannot *in puris naturalibus* attaine to heaven, which

which is a ſupernaturall end, much leſſe when it is loaden with accidentall and grievous impediments. Now then ſince the only way revealed to us of acquiring Heaven is by Jeſus Chriſt; and the firſt inlet into Chriſtianity, and acceſſe to him is by Baptiſm, as appears by the perpetuall Analogy of the New Teſtament; either Infants are not perſons capable of that end which is the perfection of humane nature, and to which the ſoule of man in its being made immortall was eſſentially deſign'd, and ſo are miſerable and deficient from the very end of humanity, if they die before the uſe of reaſon; or elſe they muſt be brought to Chriſt by the Church doores, that is by the Font and waters of Baptiſm.

Numb. 6. And in reaſon, it ſeemes more pregnant and plauſible that Infants rather then men of underſtanding ſhould be baptized: For ſince the efficacy of the Sacraments depends upon Divine Inſtitution and immediate benediction, and that they produce their effects independently upon man, in them that doe not hinder their operation; ſince Infants cannot by any act of their own promote the hope of their own ſalvation, which men of reaſon and choice may, by acts of vertue & election; it is more agreeable to the goodneſſe of God, the honour and excellency of the Sacrament, and the neceſſity of its inſtitution that it ſhould in Infants ſupply the want of humane acts and free obedience. Which the very thing it ſelfe ſeemes to ſay it does, becauſe its effect is from God, and requires nothing on man's part, but that its efficary bee not hindered: And then in Infants, the diſpoſition is equall, and the neceſſity more; they cannot *ponere obicem*, and by the ſame reaſon cannot doe others acts, which without the Sacraments doe advantage us towards our hopes of heaven, and therefore have more need to be ſupplyed by an act, and an Inſtitution Divine and ſupernaturall.

Numb. 7. And this is not only neceſſary in reſpect of the condition of Infants in capacity, to doe acts of grace, but alſo in obedience to Divine precept. For Chriſt made a Law whoſe Sanction is with an excluſive negative to them that are not baptized, [*Unleſſe a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he ſhall not enter into the Kingdome of heaven*;] If then Infants have a capacity of being co-heires with Chriſt in the Kingdome of his

Father, as Christ affirms they have, by saying [*for of such is the kingdome of heaven*] then there is a necessity that they should be brought to Baptism, there being an absolute exclusion of all persons unbaptized, and all persons not spirituall from the kingdome of heaven.

Numb. 8. But indeed it is a destruction of all the hopes and happinesse of Infants, a denying to them an exemption from the finall condition of Beasts and Insectiles, or else a designing of them to a worse misery, to say that God hath not appointed some externall or internall meanes of bringing them to an eternall happinesse: Internall they have none; for Grace being an improvement and heigthning the faculties of nature, in order to a heigthen'd and supernaturall end, Grace hath no influence or efficacy upon their faculties, who can do no naturall acts of understanding: And if there be no externall meanes, then they are destitute of all hopes, and possibilities of salvation.

Numb. 9. But thanks be to God, he hath provided better and told us accordingly, for he hath made a promise of the holy Ghost to Infants as well as to men: *The Promise is made to you and to your children*, said S. *Peter*; *The Promise of the Father, the Promise that he would send the holy Ghost:* Now if you ask how this Promise shall be convey'd to our children, we have an expresse out of the same Sermon of S. *Peter*, *Be baptized, and ye* Act. 2, 38. 39. *shall receive the gift of the holy Ghost*; So that therefore because the holy Ghost is promised, and Baptism is the meanes of receiving the Promise, therefore Baptism pertaines to them, to whom the Promise which is the effect of Baptism does appertaine. And that we may not think this Argument is fallible, or of humane collection, observe that it is the Argument of the same Apostle in expresse termes: For in the case of *Cornelius* and his Family, he justified his proceeding by this very medium, *Shall we deny Baptism to them who have received the gift of the holy Ghost as well as we?* Which Discourse if it be reduced to form of Argument sayes this; They that are capable of the same Grace are receptive of the same sign; but then (to make the Syllogism up with an assumption proper to our present purpose) Infants are capable of the same Grace, that is of the holy Ghost (for the Promise is made to our Children as

as well as to us, and S. *Paul* ſayes the Children of believing Parents are holy, and therefore have the holy Ghoſt who is the Fountaine of holineſſe and ſanctification) therefore they are to receive the ſign and the ſeale of it, that is, the Sacrament of Baptiſm.

And indeed ſince God entred a Covenant with the Jewes, which did alſo actually involve their Children, and gave them a ſign to eſtabliſh the Covenant, and its appendant Promiſe, either God does not ſo much love the Church as he did the Synagogue, and the mercies of the Goſpel are more reſtrain'd, then the mercies of the Law, God having made a Covenant with the Infants of *Iſrael*, and none with the Children of Chriſtian Parents; or if he hath, yet we want the comfort of its Conſignation; and unleſſe our Children are to be baptiz'd, and ſo intitled to the Promiſes of the new Covenant, as the Jewiſh Babes were by Circumciſion, this mercy which appertaines to Infants is ſo ſecret and undeclar'd and unconſign'd, that wee want much of that mercy and outward Teſtimony which gave them comfort and aſſurance. *Numb.* 10.

And in proportion to theſe Precepts and Revelations was the practiſe Apoſtolicall: For they (to whom Chriſt gave in Precept to make Diſciples all Nations baptizing them, and knew that Nations without Children never were, and that therefore they were paſſively concern'd in that commiſſion,) baptized whole Families, particularly that of *Stephanus* and divers others, in which it is more then probable there were ſome Minors if not ſucking Babes. And this practiſe did deſcend upon the Church in after Ages by Tradition Apoſtolicall: Of this we have ſufficient Teſtimony from *Origen*, *Pro hoc Eccleſia ab Apoſtolis traditionem accepit, etiam parvulis baptiſmum dare*: And S. *Auſtin*, *Hoc Eccleſia à majorum fide percepit*: And generally all Writers (as *Calvin* ſayes) affirm the ſame thing: For *nullus eſt Scriptor tam vetuſtus, qui non ejus originem ad Apoſtolorum ſaculum pro certo referat.* From hence the Concluſion is, that Infants ought to be baptiz'd, that it is ſimply neceſſary, that they who deny it are Hereticks, and ſuch are not to be endured becauſe they deny to Infants hopes and take away the poſſibility of their ſalvation, which is revealed to us *Numb.* 18.

In Rom. 6. tom. 2. pag. 543.

Serm. 10. de verb. Apoſt. c. 2.

4. Inſtit. cap. 16. §. 8.

on no other condition of which they are capable but Baptism. For by the insinuation of the Type, by the action of Christ, by the title Infants have to Heaven, by the precept of the Gospel, by the Energy of the Promise, by the reasonablenesse of the thing, by the infinite necessity on the Infants part, by the practise Apostolcall, by their Tradition, and the universall practise of the Church; by all these God and good people proclaime the lawfulnesse, the conveniency, and the necessity of Infants Baptism.

Numb. 12. To all this, the *Anabaptist* gives a soft and gentle Answer, that it is a goodly harangue, which upon strict examination will come to nothing, that it pretends fairely and signifies little; That some of these Allegations are false, some impertinent, and all the rest insufficient.

Numb. 13. For the Argument from Circumcision is invalid upon infinite considerations; Figures and Types prove nothing, unlesse a Commandement goe along with them, or some expresse to signifie such to be their purpose: For the Deluge of Waters and the Ark of *Noah* were a figure of Baptism said *Peter*; and if therefore the circumstances of one should be drawn to the other, we should make Baptism a prodigy rather then a Rite: The Paschall Lamb was a Type of the Eucharist which succeeds the other as Baptism does to Circumcision; but because there was in the manducation of the Paschall Lamb, no prescription of Sacramentall drink, shall we thence conclude that the Eucharist is to be ministred but in one kind? And even in the very instance of this Argument, supposing a correspondence of analogy between Circumcision and Baptism, yet there is no correspondence of identity: For although it were granted that both of them did consign the Covenant of Faith, yet there is nothing in the circumstance of childrens being circumcised that so concernes that Mystery, but that it might very well be given to Children, and yet Baptism only to men of reason; because Circumcision left a Character in the flesh, which being imprinted upon Infants did its work to them when they came to age; and such a Character was necessary because there was no word added to the sign; but Baptism imprints nothing that remaines on the body, and if it leaves a Character at all it is upon the soule, to which also the word is added which is as much

a

a part of the Sacrament as the signe it selfe is; for both which reasons, it is requisite that the persons baptized should be capable of reason, that they may be capable both of the word of the Sacrament, and the impresse made upon the Spirit: Since therefore the reason of this parity does wholly faile, there is no thing left to inferre a necessity of complying in this circumstance of age any more then in the other annexes of the Type: And the case is cleare in the Bishop's Question to *Cyprian*, for why shall not Infants be baptized just upon the eighth day as well as circumcised? If the correspondence of the Rites be an Argument to inferre one circumstance which is impertinent and accidentall to the mysteriousnesse of the Rite, why shall it not inferre all? And then also Femals must not be baptiezd, because they were not circumcised: But it were more proper if we would understand it right, to prosecute the analogy from the Type to the Anti-type by way of letter and spirit, and signification, and as Circumcision figures Baptism, so also the adjuncts of the Circumcision shall signifie something, spirituall, in the adherencies of Baptism: And therefore as Infants were circumcised, so spirituall Infants shall be baptized, which is spirituall Circumcision; for therfore Babes had the ministry of the Type, to signifie that we must when we give our names to Christ become νήπιοι ἐν κακίᾳ children in malice, [*for unlesse you become like one of these little ones, you cannot enter into the Kingdome of heaven*] said our blessed Saviour, and then the Type is made compleat. And this seemes to have been the sense of the Primitive Church; for in the Age next to the Apostles they gave to all baptized persons milk and honey to represent to them their duty, that though in age and understanding they were men, yet they were Babes in Christ, and children in malice. But to inferre the sense of the Pædo-baptists is so weak a manner of arguing that *Austin* whose device it was (and men use to bee in love with their own fancies) at the most pretended it but as probable and a meare conjecture.

L. 3. Epist. 8. ad Fidum.

And as ill successe will they have with the other Arguments as with this; For from the action of Christs blessing Infants to inferre that they are to be baptized, proves nothing so much

Numb. 14.

as that there is great want of better Arguments; The Concluſion would be with more probability derived thus: Chriſt bleſſed children and ſo diſmiſſed them, but baptized them not, therefore Infants are not to be baptized: But let this be as weak as its enemy, yet that Chriſt did not baptize them, is an Argument ſufficient that Chriſt hath other wayes of bringing them to heaven then by baptiſm, he paſſed his act of grace upon them by benediction and impoſition of hands.

Numb. 15. And therefore, although neither Infants nor any man in *puris naturalibus* can attain to a ſupernaturall end without the addition of ſome inſtrument or meanes of Gods appointing ordinarily and regularly, yet where God hath not appointed a Rule nor an Order, as in the caſe of Infants we contend he hath not, the Argument is invalid. And as we are ſure that God hath not commanded Infants to be baptized; ſo we are ſure God will doe them no injuſtice, nor damn them for what they cannot help.

Numb. 16. And therefore, let them be preſſed with all the inconveniences that are conſequent to Originall ſinne, yet either it will not be laid to the charge of Infants, ſo as to be ſufficient to condemn them; or if it could, yet the mercy and abſolute goodneſſe of God will ſecure them, if he takes them away before they can glorifie him with a free obedience; *Quid ergo feſtinat innocens ætas ad remiſſionem peccatorum*, was the Queſtion of *Tertullian*, (*lib. de bapt.*) he knew no ſuch danger from their Originall guilt as to drive them to a laver of which in that Age of innocence they had no need, as he conceived. And therefore, there is no neceſſity of flying to the help of others, for tongue, and heart, and faith, and prediſpoſitions to baptiſm; for what need all this ſtirre? as Infants without their own conſent, without any act of their own, and without any exteriour ſolennity contracted the guilt of *Adams* ſinne, and ſo are lyable to all the puniſhment which can with juſtice deſcend upon his poſterity who are perſonally innocent; ſo Infants ſhall be reſtored without any ſolennity or act of their own, or of any other men for them, by the ſecond *Adam*, by the redemption of Jeſus Chriſt, by his righteouſneſſe and mercies applyed either immediatly, or how or when he ſhall be pleaſed to appoint. And ſo *Auſtin's*

Argument

Argument will come to nothing without any need of God-fathers, or the faith of any body else. And it is too narrow a conception of God Almighty, because he hath tyed us to the observation of the Ceremonies of his own institution, that therefore he hath tyed himselfe to it. Many thousand wayes there are by which God can bring any reasonable soule to himselfe: But nothing is more unreasonable, then because he hath tyed all men of years and discretion to this way, therefore we of our own heads shall carry Infants to him that way without his direction: The conceit is poore and low, and the action consequent to it is too bold and ventrous, *mysterium meum mihi & filiis domus meæ*: Let him doe what he please to Infants, wee must not.

Only this is certain, that God hath as great care of Infants as of others, and because they have no capacity of doing such acts as may be in order to acquiring salvation, God will by his own immediate mercy bring them thither where he hath intended them; but to say that therefore he will doe it by an externall act and ministery, and that confin'd to a particular, *viz.* This Rite and no other, is no good Argument, unlesse God could not doe it without such meanes, or that he had said he would not: And why cannot God as well doe his mercies to Infants now immediately, as he did before the institution either of Circumcision or Baptism? *Numb.* 17.

However, there is no danger that Infants should perish for want of this externall Ministery, much lesse for prevaricating Christs precept of *Nisi quis renatus fuerit, &c.* For first, the Water and the Spirit in this place signifie the same thing; and by Water is meant the effect of the Spirit, cleansing and purifying the Soule, as appears in its parallel place of Christ baptizing with the Spirit and with Fire. For although this was literally fulfilled in Pentecost, yet morally there is more in it, for it is the sign of the effect of the holy Ghost, and his productions upon the soule; and it was an excellency of our blessed Saviour's office, that he baptizes *all* that come to him with the holy Ghost and with fire; for so S. *John* preferring Christs mission and office before his own, tells the Jewes, not Christ's Disciples, that Christ shall baptize them with Fire and the holy Spi- *Numb.* 18.

rit

rit, that is, *all that come to him*, as *John the Baptist* did with water, for so lies the Antithesis: And you may as well conclude that Infants must also passe through the fire as through the water. And that we may not think this a trick to elude the pressure of this place, *Peter* sayes the same thing; for when he had said that Baptism saves us, he addes by way of explication [*not the washing of the flesh, but the confidence of a good Conscience towards God*] plainly saying that it is not water, or the purifying of the body, but the cleansing of the Spirit, that does that which is supposed to be the effect of Baptism; and if our Saviour's exclusive negative be expounded by analogy to this of *Peter*, as certainly the other parallel instance must, and this may, then it will be so farre from proving the necessity of Infants Baptism, that it can conclude for no man that he 's oblig'd to the Rite; and the doctrine of the Baptism is only to derive from the very words of Institution, and not be forced from words which were spoken before it was Ordain'd. But to let passe this advantage, and to suppose it meant of externall Baptism, yet this no more inferres a necessity of Infant's Baptism, then the other words of Christ inferre a necessity to give them the holy Communion, *Nisi comederitis carnem filii hominis, & biberitis sanguinem, non introibitis in regnum cœlorum*; and yet we doe not think these words sufficient Argument to communicate them; if men therefore will doe us Justice, either let them give both Sacraments to Infants, as some Ages of the Church did, or neither. For the wit of man is not able to shew a disparity in the Sanction, or in the Energie of its expression. And therefore they were honest that understood the obligation to be parallel, and performed it accordingly, and yet because we say they were deceived in one instance, and yet the obligation (all the world cannot reasonably say but) is the same; they are as honest and as reasonable that doe neither. And since the Ancient Church did with an equal opinion of necessity give them the Communion, and yet men nowadayes do not, why shall men be more burthened with a prejudice and a name of obloquy, for not giving the Infants one Sacrament more then they are disliked for not affording them the other. If *Anabaptist* shall be a name of digrace, why shall not some

other

other name be invented for them that deny to communicate Infants, which ſhall be equally diſgracefull, or elſe both the opinions ſignified by ſuch names, be accounted no diſparagement, but receive their eſtimate according to their truth?

Of which truth ſince we are now taking account from pre- *Numb.* 19.
tences of Scripture, it is conſiderable that the diſcourſe of S. *Peter* which is pretended for the intitling Infants to the Promiſe of the holy Ghoſt, and by conſequence to Baptiſm, which is ſuppoſed to be its inſtrument and conveyance, is wholly a fancy, and hath in it nothing of certainty or demonſtration, and not much probability. For beſides that the thing it ſelfe is unreaſonable, and the holy Ghoſt works by the heigthning and improving our naturall faculties, and therefore is a promiſe that ſo concernes them as they are reaſonable creatures, and may have a title to it, in proportion to their nature, but no poſſeſſion or reception of it, till their faculties come into act; beſides this, I ſay, the words mentioned in S. *Peter*'s Sermon (which are the only record of the promiſe) are interpreted upon a weak miſtake: The promiſe belongs to you and to your children, therefore Infants are actually receptive of it in that capacity. That's the Argument; but the reaſon of it is not yet diſcovered, nor ever will, for [*to you and your children*] is to you and your poſterity, to you & your children when they are of the ſame capacity, in which you are effectually receptive of the promiſe: But he that when ever the word [*children*] is uſed in Scripture ſhall by [*children*] underſtand Infants, muſt needs believe that in all *Iſrael* there were no men, but all were Infants; and if that had been true, it had beene the greater wonder they ſhould overcome the *Anakims* and beat the King of *Moab*, and march ſo farre, and diſcourſe ſo well, for they were all called the children of *Iſrael*.

And for the Allegation of S. *Paul* that Infants are holy, if *Numb.* 20.
their Parents be faithfull, it ſignifies nothing but that they are holy by deſignation, juſt as *Jeremy* and *John Baptiſt* were ſanctified in their Mothers womb, that is they were appointed and deſign'd for holy Miniſteries; but had not received the Promiſe of the Father the gift of the holy Ghoſt, for all that ſanctification; and juſt ſo the Children of Chriſtian Parents are ſanctified,

that is design'd to the service of Jesus Christ, and the future participation of the Promises.

Numb. 21. And as the Promise appertaines not (for ought appears) to Infants in that capacity and consistence, but only by the title of their being reasonable creatures, and when they come to that act of which by nature they have the faculty; so if it did, yet Baptism is not the meanes of conveying the holy Ghost. For that which *Peter* sayes, *be baptized and ye shall receive the holy Ghost*, signifies no more then this: First be baptized and then by imposition of the Apostles hands (which was another mystery and rite,) ye shall receive the Promise of the Father: And this is nothing but an insinuation of the rite of confirmation, as is to this sense expounded by divers Ancient Authors, and in ordinary ministry the effect of it is not bestowed upon any unbaptized persons; for it is in order next after Baptism; and upon this ground *Peter*'s Argument in the case of *Cornelius* was concluding enough *à majori ad minus*: Thus the holy Ghost was bestowed upon him and his Family, which gift by ordinary ministery was consequent to Baptism, (not as the effect is to the cause or to the proper instrument, but as a consequent is to an antecedent in a chaine of causes accidentally and by positive institution depending upon each other) God by that miracle did give testimony, that the persons of the men were in great dispositions towards Heaven, and therefore were to be admitted to those Rites, which are the ordinary inlets into the Kingdome of Heaven. But then from hence to argue that wherever there is a capacity of receiving the same grace, there also the same sign is to be ministred, and from hence to inferre Pædo-baptism, is an Argument very fallacious upon severall grounds. First, because Baptism is not the sign of the holy Ghost, but by another mystery it was conveyed ordinarily, and extraordinarily, it was conveyed independently from any mystery, and so the Argument goes upon a wrong supposition. Secondly, if the supposition were true, the proposition built upon it is false; for they that are capable of the same grace, are not alwayes capable of the same sign; for women under the Law of *Moses* although they were capable of the righteousnesse of Faith, yet they were not capable of the sign of Circumcision: For God does not alwayes

alwayes convey his graces in the ſame manner, but to ſome mediately, to others immediatly; and there is no better inſtance in the world of it, then the gift of the holy Ghoſt (which is the thing now inſtanc'd in this conteſtation) for it is certain in Scripture, that it was ordinarily given by impoſition of hands, and that after Baptiſm; (And when this came into an ordinary miniſtery, it was called by the Ancient Church Chriſm or Confirmation) but yet it was given ſometimes without impoſition of hands, as at Pentecoſt and to the Family of *Cornelius*; ſometimes before Baptiſm, ſometimes after, ſometimes in conjunction with it.

And after all this, leaſt theſe Arguments ſhould not aſcertaine their Cauſe, they fall on complaining againſt God, and will not be content with God, unleſſe they may baptize their Children, but take exceptions that God did more for the Children of the Jewes. But why ſo? Becauſe God made a Covenant with their Children actually as Infants, and conſign'd it by Circumciſion: Well; ſo he did with our children too in their proportion. He made a Covenant of ſpirituall Promiſes on his part, and ſpirituall and reall ſervices on ours; and this pertains to Children when they are capable, but made with them as ſoon as they are alive, and yet not ſo as with the Jewes Babes; for as their rite conſign'd them actually, ſo it was a Nationall and temporall bleſſing and Covenant, as a ſeparation of them from the portion of the Nations, a marking them for a peculiar people, (and therefore while they were in the Wilderneſſe and ſeparate from the commixture of all people, they were not at all circumciſed) but as that rite did ſeale the righteouſneſſe of Faith, ſo by vertue of its adherency, and remanency in their fleſh, it did that work when the Children came to age. But in Chriſtian Infants the caſe is otherwiſe; for the new Covenant being eſtabliſh'd upon better Promiſes, is not only to better purpoſes, but alſo in diſtinct manner to be underſtood; when their ſpirits are as receptive of a ſpirituall act or impreſſe as the bodies of Jewiſh Children were of the ſign of Circumciſion, then it is to be conſign'd: But this buſineſſe is quickly at an end, by ſaying that God hath done no leſſe for ours, then for their Children; for hee will doe the *Numb.* 22.

mercies of a Father and Creator to them, and he did no more to the other; but he hath done more to ours; for he hath made a Covenant with them and built it upon Promises of the greatest concernment; he did not so to them: But then for the other part which is the maine of the Argument, that unlesse this mercy be consign'd by Baptism, as good not at all in respect of us, because we want the comfort of it; this is the greatest vanity in the world: For when God hath made a Promise pertaining also to our Children (for so our Adversaries contend, and we also acknowledge in its true sense) shall not this Promise, this word of God be of sufficient truth, certainty, and efficacy to cause comfort, unlesse we tempt God and require a sign of him? May not Christ say to these men as sometime to the Jewes, *a wicked and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign, but no sign shall be given unto it?* But the truth on't is, this Argument is nothing but a direct quarrelling with God Almighty.

*Numb.*23. Now since there is no strength in the Doctrinall part, the practise and precedents Apostolicall and Ecclesiasticall, will be of lesse concernment, if they were true as is pretended, because actions Apostolicall are not alwayes Rules for ever; it might be fit for them to doe it *pro loco & tempore* as divers others of their Institutions, but yet no engagement past thence upon following Ages; for it might be convenient at that time, in the new spring of Christianity, and till they had engag'd a considerable party, by that meanes to make them parties against the Gentiles Superstition, and by way of pre-occupation to ascertain them to their own sect when they came to be men; or for some other reason not trasmitted to us, because the Question of fact it selfe is not sufficiently determin'd. For the insinuation of that precept of baptizing *all Nations*, of which Children certainly are a part, does as little advantage as any of the rest, because other parallel expressions of Scripture doe determine and expound themselves to a sence that includes not all persons absolutely, but of a capable condition, as *adorate eum omnes gentes, & psallite Deo omnes nationes terræ*, and divers more.

*Numb.*24. As for the conjecture concerning the Family of *Stephanus*, at

at the best it is but a conjecture, and besides that it is not prov'd that there were Children in the Family; yet if that were granted, it followes not that they were baptized, because by [*whole Families*] in Scripture is meant all persons of reason and age within the Family; for it is said, of the Ruler at *Capernaum*, *that he believed and all his house*: Now you may also suppose that in his house were little Babes, that is likely enough, and you may suppose that they did believe too before they could understand, but that's not so likely; and then the Argument from baptizing of *Stephen's* houshold may bee allowed just as probable: But this is unman-like to build upon such slight aëry conjectures. Joh. 4.

But Tradition by all meanes must supply the place of Scripture, and there is pretended a Tradition Apostolicall, that Infants were baptized: But at this we are not much moved; For we who rely upon the written Word of God as sufficient to establish all true Religion, doe not value the Allegation of Traditions: And however the world goes, none of the Reformed Churches can pretend this Argument against this opinion, because they who reject Tradition when tis against them, must not pretend it at all for them: But if wee should allow the Topick to be good, yet how will it be verified? for so farre as it can yet appeare, it relies wholly upon the Testimony of *Origen*, for from him *Austin* had it. Now a Tradition Apostolicall if it be not consign'd with a fuller Testimony then of one person whom all after-Ages have condemn'd of many errors, will obtain so little reputation amongst those who know that things have upon greater Authority pretended to derive from the Apostles, and yet falsly, that it will be a great Argument that he is credulous and weak, that shall be determin'd by so weak probation in matters of so great concernment. And the truth of the businesse is, as there was no command of Scripture to oblige Children to the suscepion of it, so the necessity of Pædobaptism was not determin'd in the Church till in the eighth Age, after Christ, but in the yeare 418 in the *Milevitan* Councell, a Provinciall of *Africa*, there was a Canon made for Pædo-baptism; never till then! I grant it was practiz'd in *Africa* before that time, and they or some of them thought well of *Numb.* 25.

it, and though that be no Argument for us to think so, yet none of them did ever before, pretend it to be necessary, none to have been a precept of the Gospel. S. *Austin* was the first that ever preach'd it to be absolutely necessary, and it was in his heat and anger against *Pelagius* who had warm'd and chafed him so in that Question that it made him innovate in other doctrines possibly of more concernment then this. And that although this was practised anciently in *Africa*, yet that it was without an opinion of necessity, and not often there, nor at all in other places, we have the Testimony of a learned Pædo-baptist, *Ludovicus Vives*, who in his Annotations upon S. *Austin*, *De Civit. Dei. l.* 1. *c.* 27. affirms, *Neminem nisi adultum antiquitùs solere baptizari.*

Numb. 26. But besides that the Tradition cannot be proved to be Apostolicall; we have very good evidence from Antiquity, that it was the opinion of the Primitive Church, that Infants ought not to be baptiz'd; and this is clear in the sixth Canon of the Councell of *Neocæsarea*, The words are these, ἐὰν κυοφορήσῃ ὅπ δεῖ φωτίζεδ ὅποτε βέλε· οὐδὲν γὰ κοινωνεῖ ἡ πίπτσα τῷ πιπτοέν. διὰ τὸ ἑκάτε ἰδίαν ἡ αἵρεσιν ἡ ἐν τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ δείκνυδ: The sence is this, A woman with child may be baptized when she please; For her Baptism concernes not the child. The reason of the connexion of the parts of that Canon is in the following words, because every one in that Confession is to give a demonstration of his own choyce and election: Meaning plainly, that if the Baptism of the Mother did also passe upon the child, it were not fit for a pregnant woman to receive Baptism, because in that Sacrament there being a Confession of Faith, which Confession supposes understanding, and free choyce, it is not reasonable the child should be consign'd with such a mystery, since it cannot doe any act of choyce or understanding: The Canon speaks reason, and it intimates a practise which was absolutely universall in the Church, of interrogating the Catechumens concerning the Articles of Creed: Which is one Argument that either they did not admit Infants to Baptism, or that they did prevaricate egregiously in asking Questions of them, who themselves knew were not capable of giving answer.

And

And to ſupply their incapacity by the Anſwer of a God-father, is but the ſame unreaſonableneſſe acted with a worſe circumſtance: And there is no ſenſible account can be given of it; for that which ſome imperfectly murmure concerning ſtipulations civill perform'd by Tutors in the name of their Pupils, is an abſolute vanity: For what if by poſitive Conſtitution of the Romans ſuch ſolennities of Law are required in all ſtipulations, and by indulgence are permitted in the caſe of a notable benefit accruing to Minors, muſt God be tyed, and Chriſtian Religion tranſact her myſteries by proportion and complyance with the Law of the Romans? I know God might if he would have appointed Godfathers to give Anſwer in behalfe of the Children, and to be fidejuſſors for them; but we cannot find any Authority or ground that he hath, and if he had, then it is to be ſuppoſed he would have given them Commiſſion to have tranſacted the ſolennity with better circumſtances, and given Anſwers with more truth. For the Queſtion is asked of believing in the preſent. And if the Godfathers anſwer in the name of the child, [*I doe believe*] it is notorious they ſpeak falſe and ridiculouſly; for the Infant is not capable of believing, and if he were, he were alſo capable of diſſenting, and how then doe they know his mind? And therefore *Tertullian* gives advice that the Baptiſm of Infants ſhould bee deferred till they could give an account of their Faith, and the ſame alſo is the Councell of * *Gregory* Biſhop of *Nazianzum*, although he allowes them to haſten it in caſe of neceſſity; for though his reaſon taught him what was fit, yet he was overborn with the practiſe and opinion of his Age, which began to beare too violently upon him, and yet in another place he makes mention of ſome to whom Baptiſm was not adminſtred διὰ παιότητα, by reaſon of Infancy; To which if we adde that the Parents of S. *Auſtin*, S. *Hierom*, and S. *Ambroſe* although they were Chriſtian, yet did not baptiſe their children before they were 30 years of age, it will be very conſiderable in the example, and of great efficacy for deſtroying the ſuppoſed neceſſity or derivation from the Apoſtles.

Numb. 27. Quid ni neceſſe eſt (ſic legit Franc. Iunius in notis ad Tertul.) ſponſores etiam periculo ingeri qui & ipſi per mortalitatem deſtituere promiſſiones ſuas poſſint, & proventu malæ indolis falli? *Tertul. lib. de baptiſ. cap.* 18.

Lib. de baptiſ. prope finem, cap. 18. itaque pro perſonæ cujuſque conditione ac diſpoſitione, etiam ætate, cunctatio baptiſmi utilior eſt, præcipuè tamen circa parvulos.... Fiant Chriſtiani cum Chriſtum noſſe potuerint.

* Orat. 40, quæſt in S. Baptiſma.

But however, it is againſt the perpetuall analogy of Chriſts Doctrine to baptize Infants: For beſides that Chriſt never gave any

Numb. 28.

any precept to baptize them, nor ever himself nor his Apostles (that appears) did baptize any of them; All that either he or his Apostles said concerning it, requires such previous dispositions to Baptism of which Infants are not capable, and these are Faith and Repentance: And not to instance in those innumerable places that require Faith before this Sacrament, there needs no more but this one saying of our blessed Saviour, *He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned*; plainly thus, Faith and Baptism in conjunction will bring a man to heaven; but if he have not Faith, Baptism shall doe him no good. So that if Baptism be necessary then, so is Faith, and much more; for want of Faith damnes absolutely; it is not said so of the want of Baptism. Now if this decretory sentence be to be understood of persons of age, and if Children by such an Answer (which indeed is reasonable enough) be excused from the necessity of Faith, the want of which regularly does damne, then it is sottish to say the same incapacity of reason and Faith shall not excuse from the actuall susception of Baptism, which is lesse necessary, and to which Faith and many other acts are necessary predispositions when it is reasonably and humanely received. The Conclusion is, that Baptism is also to be deferr'd till the time of Faith: And whether Infants have Faith or no, is a Question to be disputed by persons that care not how much they say, nor how little they prove.

Mar. 16.

Numb. 29. 1. Personall and actuall Faith they have none; for they have no acts of understanding; and besides how can any man know that they have, since he never saw any sign of it, neither was he told so by any one that could tell? 2. Some say they have imputative Faith; but then so let the Sacrament be too, that is, if they have the Parents Faith or the Churches, then so let Baptism be imputed also by derivation from them, that as in their Mothers womb, and while they hang on their breasts, they live upon their Mothers nourishment, so they may upon the Baptism of their Parents or their Mother the Church. For since Faith is necessary to the susception of Baptism (and they themselves confesse it by striving to finde out new kinds of Faith to dawb the matter up) such as the Faith is, such must be the

Sacrament:

Sacrament: for there is no proportion between an actuall Sacrament and an imputative Faith, this being in immediate and neceſſary order to that: And whatſoever can be ſaid to take off from the neceſſity of actuall Faith, all that and much more may be ſaid to excuſe from the actuall ſuſception of Baptiſm. 3. The firſt of theſe devices was that of *Luther* and his Scholars, the ſecond of *Calvin* and his; and yet there is a third device which the Church of *Rome* teaches, and that is, that Infants have habituall Faith: But who told them ſo? how can they prove it? what Revelation, or reaſon teaches any ſuch thing? Are they by this habite ſo much as diſpoſed to an actuall beliefe without a new maſter? Can an Infant ſent into a *Mahumetan* Province be more confident for Chriſtianity when he comes to be a man, then if he had not been baptized? Are there any acts precedent, concomitant or conſequent to this pretended habit? This ſtrange invention is abſolutely without art, without Scripture, Reaſon or Authority: But the men are to be excuſed unleſſe there were a better; But for all theſe ſtratagemes, the Argument now alledged againſt the Baptiſm of Infants is demonſtrative and unanſwerable.

To which alſo this conſideration may be added, that if Baptiſm be neceſſary to the ſalvation of Infants, upon whom is the impoſition laid? To whom is the command given? to the Parents or to the Children? not to the Children, for they are not capable of a Law; not to the Parents, for then God hath put the ſalvation of innocent Babes into the power of others; and Infants may be damn'd for their Fathers careleſſneſſe or malice. It followes that it is not neceſſary at all to be done to them, to whom it cannot be preſcrib'd as a Law, and in whoſe behalfe it cannot be reaſonably intruſted to others with the appendant neceſſity; and if it be not neceſſary, it is certain it is not reaſonable, and moſt certain it is nowhere in termes preſcribed, and therefore it is to be preſumed, that it ought to be underſtood and adminiſtred according as other precepts are with reference to the capacity of the ſubject, and the reaſonableneſſe of the thing. *Numb.* 30.

For I conſider, that the baptizing of Infants does ruſh us upon ſuch inconveniences which in other Queſtions we avoid like Rocks, which will appear if we Diſcourſe thus. *Numb.* 31.

Either Baptiſm produces ſpirituall effects, or it produces them not: If it produces not any, why is ſuch contention about it, what are we the nearer heaven if we are baptized? and if it be neglected, what are we the farther off? But if (as without all peradventure all the *Pædo-baptiſts* will ſay) Baptiſm doe doe a work upon the ſoule, producing ſpirituall benefits and advantages, theſe advantages are produc'd by the externall work of the Sacrament alone, or by that as it is help'd by the co-operation and prediſpoſitions of the *ſuſcipient*.

If by the externall work of the Sacrament alone, how does this differ from the *opus operatum* of the Papiſts, ſave that it is worſe? for they ſay the Sacrament does not produce its effect but in a *ſuſcipient* diſpoſed by all requiſites and due preparatives of piety, faith, and repentance; though in a ſubject ſo diſpoſed, they ſay the Sacrament by its own vertue does it; but this opinion ſayes it does it of it ſelfe without the help, or ſo much as the coexiſtence of any condition but the meare reception.

But if the Sacrament does not doe its work alone, but *per modum recipientis* according to the prediſpoſitions of the ſuſcipient, then becauſe Infants can neither hinder it, nor doe any thing to further it, it does them no benefit at all. And if any man runs for ſuccour to that exploded χρησυγαλὸν, that Infants have Faith, or any other inſpir'd habite of I know not what or how, we deſire no more advantage in the world, then that they are conſtrained to an anſwer without Revelation, againſt reaſon, common ſenſe, and all the experience in the world.

The ſumme of the Argument in ſhort, is this though under another repreſentment.

Either Baptiſm is a meare *Ceremony*, or it implyes a *Duty* on our part. If it be a Ceremony only, how does it ſanctifie us, or *make the commers theruuto perfect?* If it implyes a *Duty* on our part, how then can Children receive it, who cannot doe duty at all?

And indeed, this way of Miniſtration makes Baptiſm to be wholly an outward duty, a work of the Law, a carnall Ordinance, it makes us adhere to the letter, without regard of the Spirit, to be ſatisfied with ſhadowes, to return to bondage,

to

to relinquiſh the myſteriouſneſſe, the ſubſtance and Spirituality of the Goſpel. Which Argument is of ſo much the more conſideration, becauſe under the Spirituall Covenant, or the Goſpel of Grace, if *the myſtery* goes not before the *Symbol* (which it does when the Symbols are Seales and Conſignations of the Grace, as it is ſaid the Sacraments are) yet it alwayes accompanies it, but never followes in order of time: And this is clear in the perpetuall analogy of holy Scripture.

For Baptiſm is never propounded, mentioned or enjoyn'd as a meanes of remiſſion of ſinnes, or of eternall life, but ſomething of duty, choyce and ſanctity is joyn'd with it, in order to production of the end ſo mentioned, *Know ye not that as many as are baptized into Chriſt Jeſus, are baptized into his death?* Rom. 6 3. There is the myſtery and the Symbol together, and declared to bee perpetually united, ὅσοι ἐβαπτίσθημεν. All of us who were baptized into one, were baptized into the other, Not only into the Name of Chriſt, but into his death alſo: But the meaning of this as it is explained in the following words of S. *Paul*, makes much for our purpoſe: For to bee baptized into his death, ſignifies *to be buried with him in Baptiſm, that as Chriſt roſe from the dead, wee alſo ſhould walk in newneſſe of life:* That's Verſ. 4. the full myſtery of Baptiſm; For being baptized into his death, or which is all one in the next words, ἐν ὁμοιώματι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ *into the likeneſſe of his death*, cannot goe alone; *if we be ſo planted into Chriſt, we ſhall be partakers of his Reſurrection*, and that Verſ. 5. is not here inſtanced in preciſe *reward*, but in *exact Duty*, for all this is nothing but *crucifixion of the old man, a deſtroying the* Verſ. 6. *body of ſinne, that wee no longer ſerve ſinne.*

This indeed is truly to be baptized both in the *Symbol* and the *Myſtery*: Whatſoever is leſſe then this, is but the *Symbol* only, a *meare Ceremony*, an *opus operatum*, a dead letter, an empty ſhadow, an inſtrument without an agent to manage, or force to actuate it.

Plainer yet: *Whoſoever are baptized into Chriſt have put on Chriſt, have put on the new man:* But to put on this new man, is *to be formed in righteouſneſſe, and holineſſe, and truth:* This whole Argument is the very words of S. *Paul:* The Major propoſition is dogmatically determin'd, *Gal.* 3.27. The Minor in

*Ephes.*4.24. The Conclusion then is obvious, that they who are not formed new *in righteousnesse, and holinesse, and truth*, they who remaining in the present incapacites cannot *walk in newnesse of life*, they have not been *baptized into Christ*, and then they have but one member of the distinction, used by S. *Peter*, they have that Baptism *which is a putting away the filth of the flesh*; but they have not that Baptism *which is the answer of a good conscience towards God*, which is the onely *Baptism that saves us*: And this is the case of children; And then the case is thus.

1 Pet.3.21.

As Infants by the force of nature cannot put themselves into a supernaturall condition, (and therefore say the *Pædo-baptists*, they need Baptism to put them into it:) so if they be baptized before the use of reason, before the *works of the Spirit*, before the operations of Grace, before they can throw off *the works of darknesse, and live in righteousnesse and newnesse of life*, they are never the nearer: From the paines of Hell they shall be saved by the mercies of God and their own innocence, though they die *in puris naturalibus*, and Baptism will carry them no further. For that *Baptism that saves us*, is not the only *washing with water*, of which only, Children are capable, *but the answer of a good conscience towards God*, of which they are not capable till the use of reason, till they know to chuse the good and refuse the evill.

And from thence I consider anew, That all vowes made by persons under others Names, stipulations made by *Minors*, are not valid till they by a supervening act after they are of sufficient age doe ratifie them. Why then may not Infants as well make the vow *de novo*, as *de novo* ratifie that which was made for them *ab antiquo* when they come to years of choice? If the *Infant* vow be invalid till the *Manly* confirmation, why were it not as good they staid to make it till that time, before which if they doe make it, it is to no purpose? This would bee considered.

Vide Erasmum in præfat. ad Annotat. in Matth.

And in Conclusion, Our way is the the surer way, for not to baptize Children till they can give an account of their Faith, is the most proportionable to an act of reason and humanity, and it can have no danger in it: For to say that Infants may be damn'd

Numb. 32.

for

for want of Baptism, (a thing which is not in their power to acquire, they being persons not yet capable of a Law) is to affirm that of God which we dare not say of any wise and good man. Certainly it is much derogatory to Gods Justice and a plaine defiance to the infinite reputation of his goodnesse.

Numb. 33. And therefore, who ever will pertinaciously persist in this opinion of the Pædo-baptists and practise it accordingly, they pollute the blood of the everlasting Testament, they dishonour and make a pageantry of the Sacrament, they ineffectually represent a sepulture into the death of Christ, and please themselves in a sign without effect, making Baptism like the fig-tree in the Gospel, full of leaves but no fruit; And they invocate the holy Ghost in vaine, doing as if one should call upon him to illuminate a stone, or a tree.

Numb. 34. Thus farre the *Anabaptists* may argue, and men have Disputed against them with so much weaknesse and confidence, that they have been encouraged in their errour * more by the accidentall advantages we have given them by our weak arguings, then by any truth of their cause, or excellency of their wit. But the use I make of it as to our present Question is this: That since there is no direct impiety in the opinion, nor any that is apparently consequent to it, and they with so much probability doe or may pretend to true perswasion, they are with all meanes, Christian, faire, and humane, to be redargued, or instructed, but if they cannot be perswaded they must be left to God, who knowes every degree of every mans understanding, all his weaknesses and strengths, what impresse each Argument makes upon his Spirit, and how unresistible every reason is, and he alone judges his innocency and sincerity; and for the Question, I think there is so much to be pretended against that, which I believe to be the truth, that there is much more truth then evidence on our side, and therefore we may be confident as for our own particulars, but not too forward peremptorily to prescribe to others, much lesse damne, or to kill, or to persecute them that only in this particular disagree.

* ἐκ τοῖς ἑαυτῶν δόγμασι τὸν ἰσχὺν ἔχοντες, ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῖς ὑμετέρων σαθροῖς ταύτῳ πιστεύοντες, as *Nazianzen* observes of the case of the Church in his time.

Sect. XIX.

That there may be no Toleration of Doctrines inconsistent with piety or the publique good.

Numb. 1. But then for their other capitall Opinion, with all its branches, that it is not lawfull for Princes to put Malefactors to death, nor to take up defensive Armes, nor to minister an Oath, nor to contend in judgement, it is not to be disputed with such liberty as the former: For although it bee part of that Doctrine which *Clemens Alexandrinus* sayes was delivered *per secretam traditionem Apostolorum, Non licere Christianis contendere in Iudicio, nec coràm gentibus, nec coràm sanctis, & perfectum non debere Iurare*; and the other part seemes to be warranted by the eleventh Canon of the *Nicene* Councell, which enjoynes penance to them that take Armes after their conversion to Christianity; yet either these Authorities are to be slighted, or be made receptive of any interpretation rather then the Common-wealth be disarmed of its necessary supports, and all Lawes made ineffectuall and impertinent: For the interest of the republique, and the well being of bodies politick is not to depend upon the nicety of our imaginations, or the fancies of any peevish or mistaken Priests, and there is no reason a Prince should ask *John-a-Brunck*, whether his understanding will give him leave to raign, and be a King: Nay, suppose there were divers places of Scripture which did seemingly restraine the Politicall use of the Sword, yet since the avoyding a personall inconvenience, hath by all men been accounted sufficient reason to expound Scripture to any sense rather then the literall, which inferres an unreasonable inconvenience, (and therefore the *pulling out an eye, and the cutting off a hand*, is expounded by mortifying a vice, and killing a criminall habit) much rather must the Allegations against the power of the Sword endure any sence rather then it should be thought that Christianity should destroy that which is the only instrument of Justice, the restraint of vice and support of bodies politick. It is certain that Christ and his Apostles, and Christian Religion

L. 7. Stromat.

did

did comply with the moſt abſolute Government, and the moſt imperiall that was then in the world; and it could not have been at all indured in the world if it had not; for indeed the world it ſelfe could not laſt in regular and orderly communities of men, but be a perpetuall confuſion, if Princes and the Supreme Power in Bodies Politick, were not armed with a coercive power to puniſh Malefactors: The publike neceſſity, and univerſall experience of all the world convinces thoſe men of being moſt unreaſonable, that make ſuch pretences which deſtroy all Lawes, and all Communities, and the bands of civill Societies, and leave it arbitrary to every vaine or vitious perſon whether men ſhall be ſafe, or Lawes be eſtabliſhed, or a Murderer hang'd, or Princes Rule. So that in this caſe men are not ſo much to Diſpute with particular Arguments, as to conſider the Intereſt and concernment of Kingdomes and Publick Societies: For the Religion of Jeſus Chriſt is the beſt eſtabliſher of the felicity of private perſons, and of publick Communities; it is a Religion that is prudent and innocent, humane, and reaſonable, and brought infinite advantages to mankind, but no inconvenience, nothing that is unnaturall, or unſociable, or unjuſt. And if it be certain that this world cannot be governed without Lawes, and Lawes without a compulſory ſignifie nothing, then it is certain, that it is no good Religion that teaches Doctrine whoſe conſequents will deſtroy all Government; and therefore it is as much to be rooted out, as any thing that is the greateſt peſt and nuiſance to the publick intereſt: And that we may gueſſe at the purpoſes of the men, and the inconvenience of ſuch Doctrine; theſe men that did firſt intend by their Doctrine to diſarme all Princes, and bodies Politick, did themſelves take up armes to eſtabliſh their wild, and impious fancie; and indeed that Prince or Common-wealth that ſhould be perſwaded by them, would be expoſed to all the inſolencies of forraigners, and all mutinies of the teachers themſelves, and the Governours of the people could not doe that duty they owe to their people of protecting them from the rapine and malice which will be in the world as long as the world is. And therefore, here they are to be reſtrained from preaching ſuch Doctrine, if they mean to preſerve

their

their Government, and the necessity of the thing will justifie the lawfulnesse of the thing: If they think it to themselves, that cannot be helped; so long it is innocent as much as concernes the Publick; but if they preach it, they may be accounted Anthors of all the consequent inconveniences, and punisht accordingly: *No Doctrine that destroyes Government is to be endured*; For although those Doctrines are not alwayes good that serve the private ends of Princes, or the secret designes of State, which by reason of some accidents or imperfections of men may be promoted by that which is false and pretending, yet no Doctrine can be good that does not comply with the formality of Government it selfe, and the well being of bodies Politick; *Augur cum esset Cato, dicere ausus est, optimis auspiciis ea geri quæ pro Reipub. salute gererentur; quæ contra Rempub. fierent contra auspicia fieri:* Religion is to meliorate the condition of a people, not to doe it disadvantange, and therefore those Doctrines that inconvenience the Publick, are no parts of good Religion; *ut Respub. salva fit*, is a necessary consideration in the permission of Prophecyings; for according to the true, solid, and prudent ends of the Republick, so is the Doctrine to be permitted or restrained, and the men that preach it according as they are good Subjects, and right Common-wealths men: For Religion is a thing superinduced to temporall Government, and the Church is an addition of a capacity to a Common-wealth, and therefore is in no sense to disserve the necessity and just interests of that to which it is super-added for its advantage and conservation.

Cicero de senectute.

Numb. 2. And thus by a proportion to the Rules of these instances, all their other Doctrines are to have their judgement, as concerning Toleration or restraint; for all are either speculative, or practicall, they are consistent with the Publick ends or inconsistent, they teach impiety or they are innocent, and they are to be permitted or rejected accordingly. For in the Question of Toleration, the foundation of Faith, good life and Government is to be secured; in all others cases, the former considerations are effectuall.

SECT.

SECT. XX.

How farre the Religion of the Church of Rome *is Tolerable.*

BUt now concerning the Religion of the Church of *Rome* (which was the other inſtance I promiſed to conſider) we will proceed another way, and not conſider the truth or falſity of the Doctrines; for that is not the beſt way to determine this Queſtion concerning permitting their Religion or Aſſemblies; becauſe that a thing is not true, is not Argument ſufficient to conclude that he that believes it true is not to bee endured; but we are to conſider what inducements there are that poſſeſſe the underſtanding of thoſe men; whether they be reaſonable and innocent, ſufficient to abuſe or perſwade wiſe and good men, or whether the Doctrines be commenc'd upon deſigne, and manag'd with impiety, and then have effects not to be endured. *Numb.* 1.

And here firſt, I conſider that thoſe Doctrines that have had long continuance and poſſeſſion in the Church, cannot eaſily be ſuppoſed in the preſent Profeſſors to be a deſign, ſince they have received it from ſo many Ages, and it is not likely that all Ages ſhould have the ſame purpoſes, or that the ſame Doctrine ſhould ſerve the ſeverall ends of divers Ages. But however, long preſcription is a prejudice, oftentimes ſo inſupportable, that it cannot with many Arguments be retrench'd, as relying upon theſe grounds, that truth is more ancient then falſhood, that God would not for ſo many Ages forſake his Church, and leave her in an errour; that whatſoever is new, is not only ſuſpicious, but falſe; which are ſuppoſitions, pious and plauſible enough. And if the Church of *Rome* had communicated Infants ſo long as ſhe hath prayed to Saints, or baptized Infants, the communicating would have been believed with as much confidence, as the other Articles are, and the diſſentients with as much impatience rejected. But this conſideration is to be enlarg'd upon all thoſe particulars, which as they are apt to abuſe the perſons of the men and amuſe their underſtandings, *Numb.* 2.

so they are instruments of their excuse, and by making their errours to be invincible, and their opinions, though false, yet not criminall, make it also to be an effect of reason and charity, to permit the men a liberty of their Conscience, and let them answer to God for themselves and their own opinions: Such as are the beauty and splendor of their Church; their pompous Service; the statelinesse and solennity of the Hierarchy; their name of Catholick, which they suppose their own due, and to concern no other Sect of Christians; the Antiquity of many of their Doctrines; the continuall Succession of their Bishops; their immediate derivation from the Apostles; their Title to succeed S. *Peter*; the suppositall and pretence of his personall Prerogatives; the advantages which the conjunction of the Imperiall Seat with their Episcopall hath brought to that Sea; the flattering expressions of minor Bishops, which by being old Records, have obtain'd credibility; the multitude and variety of people which are of their perswasion; apparent consent with Antiquity in many Ceremonialls which other Churches have rejected; and a pretended, and sometimes an apparent consent with some elder Ages in many matters doctrinall; the advantage which is derived to them by entertaining some personall opinions of the Fathers, which they with infinite clamours see to bee cryed up to be a Doctrine of the Church of that time; The great consent of one part with another in that which most of them affirm to be *de fide*; the great differences which are commenc'd amongst their Adversaries, abusing the Liberty of Prophecying unto a very great licentiousnesse; their happinesse of being instruments in converting divers Nations; the advantages of Monarchicall Government, the benefit of which as well as the inconveniences (which though they feele they consider not) they daily doe enjoy; the piety and the austerity of their Religious Orders of men and women; the single life of their Priests and Bishops; the riches of their Church; the severity of their Fasts and their exteriour observances; the great reputation of their first Bishops for Faith and sanctity; the known holinesse of some of those persons whose Institutes the Religious Persons pretend to imitate; their Miracles false or true, substantiall or imaginary; the

casualties

caſualties and accidents that have hapned to their Adverſaries, which being chances of humanity are attributed to ſeverall cauſes according as the fancies of men and their Intereſts are pleaſed or ſatisfied; the temporall felicity of their Profeſſors; the oblique arts & indirect proceedings of ſome of thoſe who departed from them; and amongſt many other things, the names of Heretick and Schiſmatick, which they with infinite pertinacy faſten upon all that diſagree from them; Theſe things and divers others may very eaſily perſwade perſons of much reaſon and more piety, to retain that which they know to have been the Religion of their fore-Fathers, which had actuall poſſeſſion and ſeizure of mens underſtandings before the oppoſite profeſſions had a name; And ſo much the rather becauſe Religion hath more advantages upon the fancy and affections, then it hath upon Philoſophy and ſevere diſcourſes, and therefore is the more eaſily perſwaded upon ſuch grounds as theſe, which are more apt to amuſe then to ſatisfie the underſtanding.

Secondly, If we conſider the Doctrines themſelves, we ſhall finde them to be ſuperſtructures ill built, and worſe manag'd, but yet they keep the foundation, they build upon God in Jeſus Chriſt, they profeſſe the Apoſtles Creed, they retain Faith and Repentance as the ſupporters of all our hopes of Heaven, and believe many more truths then can be proved to be of ſimple and originall neceſſity to ſalvation: And therefore all the wiſeſt Perſonages of the adverſe party allowed to them poſſibility of ſalvation, whilſt their errours are not faults of their will, but weakneſſes and deceptions of the underſtanding. So that there is nothing in the *foundation of Faith*, that can reaſonably hinder them to be permitted: The foundation of Faith ſtands ſecure enough for all their vaine and unhandſome ſuperſtructures. *Numb.* 3.

But then on the other ſide, if we take account of their Doctrines as they relate to good life, or are conſiſtent or inconſiſtent with civill Government, we ſhall have other conſiderations.

Thirdly, For I conſider, that many of their Doctrines doe accidentally teach or lead to ill life, and it will appeare to any *Numb.* 4.

man that conſiders the reſult of theſe propoſitions: Attrition (which is a low and imperfect degree of ſorrow for ſin, or as others ſay a ſorrow for ſinne commenc'd upon any reaſon of temporall hope, or feare or deſire or any thing elſe) is a ſufficient diſpoſition for a man in the Sacrament of penance to receive abſolution, and be juſtified before God, by taking away the guilt of all his ſinnes, and the obligation to eternall paines. So that already the feare of Hell is quite removed upon conditions ſo eaſie, that many men take more paines to get a groat, then by this Doctrine we are oblig'd to, for the curing and acquitting all the greateſt ſinnes of a whole life, of the moſt vitious perſon in the world: And but that they affright their people with a feare of Purgatory, or with the ſeverity of Penances in caſe they will not venter for Purgatory (for by their Doctrine they may chuſe or refuſe either) there would be nothing in their Doctrine or Diſcipline to impede and ſlacken their proclivity to ſinne; but then they have as eaſy a cure for that too, with a little more charge ſometimes, but moſt commonly with leſſe trouble: For there are ſo many confraternities, ſo many priviledged Churches, Altars, Monaſteries, Cœmeteries, Offices, Feſtivals, and ſo free a conceſſion of Indulgences appendant to all theſe, and a thouſand fine devices to take away the feare of Purgatory, to commute or expiate Penances, that in no ſect of men, doe they with more eaſe and cheapneſſe reconcile a wicked life with the hopes of heaven, then in the Roman Communion.

Numb. 5. And indeed if men would conſider things upon their true grounds, the Church of *Rome* ſhould be more reproved upon Doctrines that inferre ill life, then upon ſuch as are contrariant to Faith. For falſe ſuperſtructures doe not alwayes deſtroy Faith; but many of the Doctrines they teach if they were proſecuted to the utmoſt iſſue would deſtroy good life: And therefore my quarrell with the Church of *Rome* is greater and ſtronger upon ſuch points which are not uſually conſider'd, then it is upon the ordinary diſputes, which have to no very great purpoſe ſo much diſturb'd Chriſtendome: And I am more ſcandaliz'd at her for teaching the ſufficiency of Attrition in the Sacrament, for indulging Penances ſo frequently, for remitting all

all Diſcipline, for making ſo great a part of Religon to conſiſt in externalls and Ceremonialls, for putting more force and Energy and exacting with more ſeverity the commandments of men then the precepts of Juſtice, and internall Religion: Laſtly, beſides many other things, for promiſing heaven to perſons after a wicked life upon their impertinent cryes and Ceremonialls tranſacted by the Prieſt and the dying Perſon: I confeſſe I wiſh the zeale of Chriſtendome were a little more active againſt theſe and the like Doctrines, and that men would write and live more earneſtly againſt them then as yet they have done.

But then what influence this juſt zeale is to have upon the perſons of the Profeſſors is another conſideration: For as the Phariſees did preach well and lived ill, and therefore were to be heard not imitated: So if theſe men live well though they teach ill, they are to be imitated not heard: their Doctrines by all meanes, Chriſtian and humane, are to be diſcountenanc'd, but their perſons tolerated *eatenùs*; their Profeſſion and Decrees to be rejected and condemn'd, but the perſons to be permitted, becauſe by their good lives they confute their Doctrines, that is, they give evidence, that they think no evill to be conſequent to ſuch opinions, and if they did, that they live good lives, is argument ſufficient that they would themſelves caſt the firſt ſtone againſt their own opinions, if they thought them guilty of ſuch miſdemeanours. *Numb.* 6.

Fourthly, But if we conſider their Doctrines in relation to Government, and Publick ſocieties of men, then if they prove faulty, they are ſo much the more intolerable by how much the conſequents, are of greater danger and malice: Such Doctrines as theſe, The Pope may diſpence with all oathes taken to God or man: He may abſolve Subjects from their Allegiance to their naturall Prince: Faith is not to be kept with Hereticks, Hereticall Princes may be ſlaine by their Subjects. Theſe Propoſitions are ſo depreſt, and doe ſo immediately communicate with matter, and the intereſts of men, that they are of the ſame conſideration with matters of fact, and are to be handled accordingly. To other Doctrines ill life may be conſequent; but the connexion of the antecedent and the conſequent is not (peradventure) perceiv'd or acknowledged by him that believes *Numb.* 7.

the opinion with no greater confidence then he diſavowes the effect, and iſſue of it. But in theſe, the ill effect is the direct profeſſion and purpoſe of the opinion, and therefore the man and the mans opinion is to be dealt withall, juſt as the matter of fact is to be judg'd; for it is an immediate, a perceiv'd, a direct event, and the very purpoſe of the opinion. Now theſe opinions are a direct overthrow to all humane ſociety, and mutuall commerce, a deſtruction of Government, and of the lawes and duty and ſubordination which we owe to Princes; and therefore thoſe men of the Church of *Rome* that doe hold them, and preach them, cannot pretend to the excuſes of innocent opinions, and hearty perſwaſion, to the weakneſſe of humanity, and the difficulty of things; for God hath not left thoſe truths which are neceſſary for conſervation of publike ſocieties of men, ſo intricate and obſcure, but that every one that is honeſt and deſirous to underſtand his duty, will certainly know that no Chriſtian truth deſtroyes a mans being ſociable and a member of the body Politick, co-operating to the conſervation of the whole as well as of it ſelfe. However, if it might happen that men ſhould ſincerely erre in ſuch plaine matters of fact (for there are fooles enough in the world) yet if he hold his peace, no man is to perſecute or puniſh him, for then it is meare opinion which comes not under Politicall Cogniſance, that is, that Cogniſance which onely can puniſh corporally; but if he preaches it, he is actually a Traytor, or Seditious, or Author of Perjury, or a deſtroyer of humane Society, reſpectively to the nature of the Doctrine; and the preaching ſuch Doctrines cannot claime the priviledge and immunity of a meare opinion, becauſe it is as much matter of fact, as any the actions of his diſciples and confidents, and therefore in ſuch caſes is not to be permitted, but judg'd according to the nature of the effect it hath or may have upon the actions of men.

Numb. 8. Fifthly: But laſtly, In matters mearly ſpeculative, the caſe is wholly altered, becauſe the body Politick which only may lawfully uſe the ſword, is not a competent Judge of ſuch matters which have not direct influence upon the body Politick, or upon the lives and mannners of men as they are parts of a Community (not but that Princes or Judges Temporall may have

have as much ability as others, but by reason of the incompetency of the Authority;) And *Gallio* spoke wisely, when he discoursed thus to the Jewes, *If it were a matter of wrong or wicked lewdnesse ô ye Jewes, reason would that I should hear you; But if it be a question of words, and names, and of your Law, look ye to it, for I will be no Judge of such matters:* The man spoke excellent reason; for the Cognisnance of these things did appertain to men of the other robe: but the Ecclesiasticall power, which only is competent to take notice of such questions, is not of capacity to use the Temporall sword or corporall inflictions: The meare doctrines and opinions of men are things Spirituall, and therefore not Cognoscible by a temporall Authority; and the Ecclesiasticall Authority, which is to take Cognisance is it selfe so Spirituall, that it cannot inflict any punishment corporall. Act. 18. 14.

And it is not enough to say that when the Magistrate restraines the preaching such opinions, if any man preaches them he may be punished (and then it is not for his opinion but his disobedience that he is punish'd) for the temporall power ought not to restraine Prophecyings, where the publick peace and interest is not certainly concern'd. And therefore it is not sufficient to excuse him, whose Law in that case being by an incompetent power made a scruple where there was no sinne. *Numb.* 9.

And under this consideration, come very many Articles of the Church of *Rome*, which are wholly speculative, which doe not derive upon practise, which begin in the understanding and rest there, and have no influence upon life and government, but very accidentally, and by a great many removes, and therefore are to be considered only so farre as to guide men in their perswasions, but have no effect upon the persons of men, their bodies, or their temporall condition: I instance in two; Prayer for the dead, and the Doctrine of Transubstantion, these two to be instead of all the rest. *Numb.* 10.

For the first, This Discourse is to suppose it false, and we are to direct our proceedings accordingly: And therefore I shall not need to urge with how many faire words and gay pretences, this Doctrine is set off, apt either to conzen or instruct the con- *Numb.* 11.

science

ſcience of the wiſeſt according as it is true or falſe reſpectively. But we finde (ſayes the Romaniſt) in the Hiſtory of the *Maccabees*, that the Jewes did pray and make offerings for the dead (which alſo appeares by other Teſtimonies, and by their forme of prayers ſtill extant which they uſed in the Captivity) it is very conſiderable, that ſince our bleſſed Saviour did reprove all the evill Doctrines and Traditions of the Scribes and Phariſees, and did argue concerning the dead and the Reſurrection againſt the Sadduces, yet he ſpake no word againſt this publick practiſe, but left it as he found it, which he who came to declare to us all the will of his Father would not have done, if it had not been innocent, pious and full of charity. To which by way of conſociation, if we adde that S. *Paul* did pray
2 Tim. 1. 18. for *Oneſiphorus, That God would ſhew him a mercy in that day*, that is, according to the ſtile of the New Teſtament, the day of Judgement: The reſult will be, that although it be probable, that *Oneſiphorus* at that time was dead (becauſe in his ſalutations he ſalutes his houſhold, without naming him who was the *Major domo*, againſt his cuſtome of ſalutitions in other places:) Yet beſides this, the prayer was for ſuch a bleſſing to him whoſe demonſtration and reception could not be but after death; which implies clearly, that then there is a need of mercy, and by conſequence the dead people even to the day of Judgement incluſively are the ſubject of a miſery, the object of Gods mercy, and therefore fit to be commemorated in the duties of our piety and charity, and that we are to recommend their condition to God, not only to give them more glory, in the reunion, but to pitty them to ſuch purpoſes in which they need; which becauſe they are not revealed to us in particular, it hinders us not in recommending the perſons in particular to Gods mercy, but ſhould rather excite our charity and devotion: For it being certaine that they have a need of mercy, and it being uncertain how great their need is, it may concern the prudence of charity to be the more earneſt as not knowing the greatneſſe of their neceſſity.

Numb. 12. And if there ſhould be any uncertainty in theſe Arguments, yet its having been the univerſall practiſe of the Church of God in all places, and in all Ages till within theſe hundred yeares,

yeares, is a very great inducement for any member of the Church to believe that in the first Traditions of Christianity, and the Institutions Apostolicall, there was nothing delivered against this practise, but very much to insinuate or enjoyn it; because the practise of it was at the first, and was universall. And if any man shall doubt of this, he shewes nothing but that hee is ignorant of the Records of the Church, it being plaine in *Tertullian* and S. **Cyprian* (who were the eldest Writers of the Latine Church) that in their times it was *ab antiquo*, the custome of the Church to pray for the Soules of the Faithfull departed, in the dreadfull mysteries: And it was an Institution Apostolicall (sayes one of them) and so transmitted to the following Ages of the Church, and when once it began upon slight and discontent to be contested against by *Aërius*, the man was presently condemn'd for a Heretick, as appeares in *Epiphanius*.

De corona mil. c. 3. & de monogam. c. 10.

* Ep. 66.

But I am not to consider the Arguments for the Doctrine it selfe, although the probability and faire pretence of them may help to excuse such persons who upon these or the like grounds doe heartily believe it. But I am to consider that whether it be true or false, there is no manner of malice in it, and at the worst, it is but a wrong errour upon the right side of charity, and concluded against by its Adversaries upon the confidence of such Arguments, which possibly are not so probable as the grounds pretended for it. *Numb.* 13.

And if the same judgement might be made of any more of their Doctrines, I think it were better men were not furious, in the condemning such Questions which either they understood not upon the grounds of their proper Arguments, or at least consider not, as subjected in the persons, and lessened by circumstances, by the innocency of the event, or other prudentiall considerations. *Numb.* 14.

But the other Article is harder to be judged of, and hath made greater stirres in Christendome, and hath been dasht at with more impetuous objections, and such as doe more trouble the Question of Toleration. For if the Doctrine of Transubstantiation be false (as upon much evidence we believe it is) then tis accused of introducing Idolatry, giving Divine worship *Numb.* 15.

to a Creature, adoring of bread and wine, and then comes in the precept of God to the Jewes, that those Prophets who perswaded to Idolatry should be slaine.

Deut. 13. *Numb.* 16. But here we must deliberate, for it is concerning the lives of men, and yet a little deliberation may suffice: For Idolatry is a forsaking the true God, and giving Divine Worship to a Creature or to an Idoll, that is, to an imaginary god, who hath no foundation in essence or existence: And is that kind of superstition which by Divines is called the superstition of an undue object: Now it is evident that the Object of their Adoration (that which is represented to them in their minds, their thoughts, and purposes, and by which God principally if not solely takes estimate of humane actions) in the blessed Sacrament, is the only true and eternall God, hypostatically joyned with his Holy humanity, which humanity they believe actually present under the veile of the Sacramentall signes: And if they thought him not present, they are so farre from worshipping the bread in this case, that themselves professe it to be Idolatry to doe so, which is a demonstration that their soule hath nothing in it that is Idololatricall. If their confidence and fancyfull opinion hath engag'd them upon so great mistake (as without doubt it hath) yet the will hath nothing in it, but what is a great enemy to Idolatry, *Et nihil ardet in inferno nisi propria voluntas:* And although they have done violence to all Philosophy, and the reason of man, and undone and cancelled the principles of two or three Sciences, to bring in this Article, yet they have a Divine Revelation whose literall and Grammaticall sense, if that sense were intended, would warrant them to doe violence to all the Sciences in the Circle; and indeed that, Transubstantiation is openly and violently against naturall reason, is an Argument to make them disbelieve, who believe the mystery of the Trinity in all those niceties of explication which are in the Schoole (and which now adayes passe for the Doctrine of the Church) with as much violence to the principles of naturall and supernaturall Philosophy, as can be imagin'd to be in the point of Transubstantiation.

Numb. 17. 1. But for the Article it selfe, we all say that Christ is there present some way or other extraordinary; and it will not be amisse

amiſſe to worſhip him at that time, when he gives himſelfe to us in ſo myſterious a manner, and with ſo great advantages; eſpecially ſince the whole Office is a Conſociation of divers actions of Religion and Divine Worſhip. Now in all opinions of thoſe men who think it an act of Religion to communicate and to offer; a Divine Worſhip is given to Chriſt, and is tranſmitted to him by mediation of that action and that Sacrament, and it is no more in the Church of *Rome*, but that they differ and miſtake infinitely in the manner of his preſence; which errour is wholly ſeated in the Underſtanding, and does not communicate with the will; for all agree that the Divinity and the Humanity of the Sonne of God is the ultimate and adequate object of Divine Adoration, and that it is incommunicable to any creature whatſoever, and before they venture to paſſe an Act of Adoration, they believe the bread to be annihilated or turn'd into his ſubſtance who may lawfully be worſhipped; and they who have theſe thoughts, are as much enemies of Idolatry, as they that underſtand better how to avoid that inconvenience which is ſuppoſed to be the crime, which they formally hate, and we materially avoid: This conſideration was concerning the Doctrine it ſelfe.

2. And now for any danger to mens perſons for ſuffering ſuch a Doctrine, this I ſhall ſay, that if they who doe it, are not formally guilty of Idolatry, there is no danger that they whom they perſwade to it ſhould be guilty; and what perſons ſoever believe it to be Idolatry, to worſhip the Sacrament, while that perſwaſion remaines will never bee brought to it, there is no feare of that: And he that perſwades them to doe it by altering their perſwaſions and beliefes, does no hurt but altering the opinions of the men, and abuſing their underſtandings; but when they believe it to be no Idolatry, then their ſo believing it is ſufficient ſecurity from that crime which hath ſo great a tincture and reſidency in the will, that from thence only it hath its being criminall. *Numb.* 18.

3. However, if it were Idolatry, I think the Precept of God to the Jewes of killing falſe and Idolatrous Prophets will be no warrant for Chriſtians ſo to doe: For in the caſe of the Apoſtles and the men of *Samaria*, when *James* and *John* would *Numb.* 19.

have cald for fire to destroy them even as *Elias* did under *Moses* Law, Christ distinguished the spirit of *Elias* from his own Spirit, and taught them a lesson of greater sweetnesse, and consign'd this truth to all Ages of the Church, that such severity is not consistent with the meekenesse which Christ by his example and Sermons hath made a precept Evangelicall: At most it was but a Iudiciall Law and no more of Argument to make it necessary to us, then the Mosaicall precepts of putting Adulterers to death, and trying the accused persons by the waters of jealousie.

Numb. 20. And thus in these two Instances, I have given account what is to be done in Toleration of diversity of opinions: The result of which is principally this: Let the Prince and the Secular Power have a care the Common-wealth be safe. For whether such or such a Sect of Christians be to be permitted is a question rather Politicall then Religious; for as for the concernments of Religion, these instances have furnished us with sufficient to determine us in our duties as to that particular, and by one of these all particulars may be judged.

Numb. 21. And now it were a strange inhumanity to permit Jewes in a Common-wealth, whose interest is served by their inhabitation, and yet upon equall grounds of State and Policy, not to permit differing Sects of Christians: For although possibly there is more danger, mens perswasions should be altered in a commixture of divers Sects of Christians, yet there is not so much danger when they are changed from Christian to Christian, as if they be turn'd from Christian to Iew, as many are daily in *Spaine* and *Portugall*.

Numb. 22. And this is not to be excused by saying the Church hath no power over them *qui foris sunt* as Iewes are: For it is true the Church in the capacity of Spirituall regiments hath nothing to doe with them, because they are not her Diocesse: Yet the Prince hath to doe with them, when they are subjects of his regiment: They may not be Excommunicate any more then a stone may be kild, because they are not of the Christian Communion, but they are living persons parts of the Common-Wealth, infinitely deceived in their Religion, and very dangerous if they offer to perswade men to their opinions, and are

the

the greateſt enemies of Chriſt whoſe honour and the intereſt of whoſe Service a Chriſtian Prince is bound with all his power to maintaine. And when the Queſtion is of puniſhing diſagreeing perſons with death, the Church hath equally nothing to doe with them both, for ſhe hath nothing to doe with the temporall ſword, but the Prince whoſe Subjects equally Chriſtians and Iewes are, hath equall power over their perſons; for a Chriſtian is no more a ſubject then a Iew is. The Prince hath upon them both the ſame power of life and death, ſo that the Iew by being no Chriſtian is not *foris*, or any more an exempt perſon for his body, or his life then the Chriſtian is: And yet in all Churches where the ſecular power hath temporll reaſon to tolerate the Iewes, they are tolerated without any ſcruple in Religion; which thing is of more conſideration, becauſe the Iewes are direct Blaſphemers of the Sonne of God, and Blaſphemy by their own Law the Law of *Moſes* is made capitall; And might with greater reaſon be inflicted upon them, who acknowledge its obligation then urg'd upon Chriſtians as an Authority, enabling Princes to put them to death, who are accuſed of accidentall and conſequutive Blaſphemy and Idolatry reſpectively, which yet they hate and diſavow with much zeale and heartineſſe of perſwaſion. And I cannot yet learn a reaſon why we ſhall not be more complying with them, who are of the houſhold of Faith; for at leaſt they are children though they be but rebellious children (and if they were not, what hath the Mother to doe with them any more then with the Iewes?) they are in ſome relation or habitude of the Family, for they are conſigned with the ſame Baptiſm, profeſſe the ſame Faith delivered by the Apoſtles, are erected in the ſame hope, and look for the ſame glory to be reaveled to them, at the comming of their Common Lord and Saviour, to whoſe Service according to their underſtanding they have vowed themſelves: And if the diſagreeing perſons be to be eſteemed as Heathens and Publicans, yet not worſe, *Have no company with them*, that's the worſt that is to be done to ſuch a man in S. *Pauls* judgement, *Yet count him not as an enemy, but admoniſh him as a brother.*

SECT. XXI.

Of the duty of particular Churches in allowing Communion.

Numb. 1. FRom these premises, we are easily instructed concerning the lawfulnesse or duty respectively of Christian Communion, which is differently to bee considered in respect of particular Churches to each other, and of particular men to particular Churches: For as for particular Churches, they are bound to allow Communion to all those that professe the same Faith upon which the Apostles did give Communion; For whatsoever preserves us as Members of the Church, gives us title to the Communion of Saints, and whatsoever Faith or beliefe that is to which God hath promised Heaven, that Faith makes us Members of the Catholick Church: Since therefore the Iudiciall Acts of the Church are then most prudent and religious when they neareſt imitate the example and piety of God: To make the way to Heaven straighter then God made it, or to deny to communicate with those whom God will vouchsafe to be united, and to refuse our charity to those who have the same Faith, because they have not all our opinions, and believe not every thing necessary which we over-value; is impious and Schismaticall, it inferres Tyranny on one part, and perswades and tempts to uncharitableneſſe and animosities on both; It dissolves Societies, and is an enemy to peace, it busies men in impertinent wranglings, and by names of men and titles of factions it consignes the interessed parties to act their differences to the height, and makes them neglect those advantages which piety and a good life bring to the reputation of Christian Religion and Societies.

Numb. 2. Cap. 11. Vid. Pacian. Epist. ad Sempron. 2. And therefore *Vincentius Lirinensis*, and indeed the whole Church accounted the *Donatists* Hereticks upon this very ground, because they did imperiously deny their Communion to all that were not of their perswasion; whereas the Authors of that opinion for which they first did separate, and make a Sect, because they did not break the Churches peace nor magisterially preſsed to others,

others, were in that diſagreeing and errour accounted Catholicks, *Diviſio enim & diſunio facit vos hæreticos, pax & unitas faciunt Catholicos* ſaid S. *Auſtin*; and to this ſenſe is that of S. *Paul*, *If I had all faith and had not charity, I am nothing:* He who upon confidence of his true beliefe denies a charitable Communion to his brother, loſes the reward of both. And if Pope *Victor* had been as charitable to the *Aſiaticks* as Pope *Anicetus*, and S. *Polycarp* were to each other in the ſame diſagreeing concerning Eaſter, *Victor* had not been πανδικώτερον καταδέμενος, ſo bitterly reprov'd and condemn'd as he was for the uncharitable managing of his diſagreeing by *Polycrates* and *Irenæus*; *Concordia enim quæ eſt charitatis effectus eſt unio voluntatum non opinionum.* True Faith which leads to charity leads on to that which unites wills and affections, not opinions.

l. 2. c. 95. contra liter. Petilian.

Euſeb. l. 5. c. 25. 26.

Aquin. 2. 2. q. 37 a. 1.

Upon theſe or the like conſiderations, the Emperour *Zeno* publiſh'd his ἑνωτικὸν in which he made the *Nicene* Creed to be the medium of Catholick Communion, and although he liv'd after the Councell of *Chalcedon*, yet he made not the Decrees of that Councell an inſtrument of its reſtraint and limit, as preferring the peace of Chriſtendome, and the union of charity farre before a forced or pretended unity of perſwaſion, which never was or ever will be reall and ſubſtantiall; and although it were very convenient if it could be had, yet it is therefore not neceſſary becauſe it is impoſſible; and if men pleaſe, whatever advantages to the publick would be conſequent to it, may be ſupply'd by a charitable complyance and mutuall permiſſion of opinion, and the offices of a brotherly affection preſcrib'd us by the Lawes of Chriſtianity: And we have ſeen it, that all Sects of Chriſtians, when they have an end to be ſerv'd upon a third, have permitted that liberty to a ſecond, which we now contend for, and which they formerly deny'd but now grant, that by joyning hands, they might be the ſtronger to deſtroy the third. The *Arrians* and *Meletians* joyned againſt the Catholicks: The Catholicks and *Novatians* joyn'd againſt the *Arrians*. Now if men would doe that for charity which they doe for intereſt, it were handſomer and more ingenuous; For that they doe permit each others diſagreeings for their intereſt's ſake,

Numb. 3.

convinces

convinces them of the lawfulneſſe of the thing, or elſe the unlawneſſe of their own proceedings, and therefore it were better they would ſerve the ends of charity then of faction, for then that good end would hallow the proceeding and make it both more prudent and more pious, while it ſerves the deſign of religious purpoſes.

SECT. XXII.

That particular men may communicate with Churches of different perſwaſions, and how farre they may doe it.

Numb. 1. AS for the duty of particular men in the Queſtion of communicating with Churches of different perſwaſions, it is to be regulated according to the Lawes of thoſe Churches; for if they require no impiety, or any thing unlawfull as the condition of their Communion, then they communicate with them as they are Servants of Chriſt, as Diſciples of his Doctrine and ſubjects to his Laws, and the particular diſtinguiſhing Doctrine of their Sect hath no influence or communication with him who from another Sect is willing to communicate with all the Servants of their Common Lord: For ſince no Church of one name is infallible, a wiſe man may have either the misfortune or a reaſon to believe of every one in particular, that ſhe erres in ſome Article or other, either he cannot communicate with any, or elſe he may communicate with all, that doe not make a ſinne or the profeſſion of an errour to be the condition of their Communion. And therefore, as every particular Church is bound to Tolerate diſagreeing perſons in the ſenſes and for the reaſons above explicated; ſo every particular perſon is bound to Tolerate her, that is, not to refuſe her Communion when he may have it upon innocent conditions: For what is it to me if the Greek Church denies Proceſſion of the third Perſon from the ſecond, ſo ſhe will give me the right hand of Fellowſhip, (though I affirm it) there-

fore

fore because I professe the Religion of Jesus Christ, and retain all matters of Faith and necessity? But this thing will scarce be reduced to practise, for few Churches that have fram'd bodies of Confession, and Articles, will endure any person that is not of the same confession; which is a plaine demonstration that such bodies of Confession and Articles doe much hurt, by becomming instruments of separating and dividing Communions, and making unnecessary or uncertain propositions a certaine meanes of Schism and disunion: But then men would doe well to consider whether or no such proceedings doe not derive the guilt of Schism upon them who least think it, and whether of the two is the Schismatick? he that makes unnecessary and (supposing the state of things) inconvenient impositions, or he that disobeyes them, because hee cannot without doing violence to his conscience believe them? Hee that parts Communion, because without sinne hee could not entertain it, or they that have made it necessary for him to separate, by requiring such conditions which to man are simply necessary, and to his particular are either sinfull or impossible?

The Summe of all is this, There is no security in any thing or to any person, but in the pious and hearty endeavours of a good life, and neither sinne nor error does impede it from producing its proportionate and intended effect: because it is a direct deletery to sin and an excuse to errors, by making them innocent, and therefore harmlesse. And indeed this is the intendment and design of Faith: For (that we may joyn both ends of this Discourse together) therefore certain Articles are prescribed to us, and propounded to our understanding, that so we might be supplyed with instructions, with motives and engagements to incline and determine our wills to the obedience of Christ. So that obedience is just so consequent to Faith, as the acts of will are to the dictates of the understanding: Faith therefore being in order to obedience, and so farre excellent as it selfe is a part of obedience or the promoter of it, or an engagement to it; it is evident that if obedience and a good life be secured upon the most reasonable and proper grounds of *Numb.* 2.

Christianity, that is, upon the Apostles Creed, then Faith also is secur'd. Since whatsoever is beside the duties, the order of a good life, cannot be a part of Faith, because upon Faith, a good life is built; all other Articles by not being necessary, are no otherwise to be requir'd, but as they are to be obtain'd and sourd out, that is, morally, and fallibly, and humanely; It is fit all truths be promoted fairely and properly, and yet but few Articles prescribed Magisterially, nor framed into Symbols and bodies of Confession; least of all after such composures, should men proceed so furiously as to say all disagreeing after such declarations to be damnable for the future, and capitall for the present. But this very thing is reason enough to make men more limited in their prescriptions, because it is more charitable in such suppositions so to doe.

Numb. 3. But in the thing it selfe, because few kinds of errours are damnable, it is reasonable as few should be capitall. And because every thing that is damnable in it selfe and before Gods Judgement Seat, is not discernable before men (and questions disputable are of this condition) it is also very reasonable that fewer be capitall then what are damnable, and that such Questions should bee permitted to men to believe because they must be left to God to judge. It concernes all persons to see that they doe their best to finde out truth, and if they doe, it is certain that let the errour be never so damnable, they shall escape the errour or the misery of being damn'd for't. And if God will not be angry at men for being invincibly deceiv'd, why should men be angry one at another? For he that is most displeased at another mans errour, may also be tempted in his own will, and as much deceived in his understanding: For if he may faile in what he can chuse, he may also faile in what he cannot chuse: His understanding is no more secur'd then his will, nor his Faith more then his obedience. It is his own fault if he offends God in either but whatsoever is not to be avoided; as errours, which are incident oftentimes even to the best and most inquisitive of men, are not offences against God, and therefore not to be punished, or restrained by men; but all such opinions in which the publick interests of the Com-

Common-wealth, and the foundation of Faith, and a good life, are not concern'd, are to be permitted freely, *Quiſque abundet in ſenſu ſuo* was the Doctrine of S. *Paul*, and that is Argument and Concluſion too; and they were excellent words which S. *Ambroſe* ſaid in atteſtation of this great truth,

Nec Imperiale eſt libertatem dicendi negare, nec ſacerdotale quod ſentias non dicere.

Ἀχῶ ἰχῶ.

THE END.

A DISCOURSE CONCERNING PRAYER *Ex tempore*, OR, By pretence of the Spirit, *In justification of Authorized and Set-forms of* LITURGIE.

BIBL. CANT. ACAD.

---

1 COR. 14.32.

Πνεύματα προφητῶν προφήταις ὑποτάσσεται· Οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἀκαταστασίας ὁ Θεὸς, ἀλλ' εἰρήνης ὡς ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῶν ἁγίων.

And the spirits of the Prophets are subject to the Prophets. For God is not the Author of confusion, but of peace, as in all Churches of the Saints.

Printed for *Richard Royston*, 1647.

876.67

A Diſcourſe concerning PRAYER *Ex tempore*, &c.

I Have read over this Book which the Aſſembly of Divines is pleaſed to call *The Directory for Prayer*; I confeſſe I came to it with much expectation, and was in ſome meaſure confident I ſhould have found it an exact and unblameable modell of Devotion, free from all thoſe objections which men of their own perſwaſion had obtruded againſt the publike Liturgy of the Church of *England*; or at leaſt, it ſhould have been compoſed with ſo much artifice and fineneſſe, that it might have been to all the world an Argument of their learning and excellency of ſpirit, if not of the goodneſſe and integrity of their Religion and purpoſes. I ſhall give no other character of the whole, but that the publike diſreliſh which I finde amongſt perſons of great piety, of all qualities, not only of great, but even of ordinary underſtandings, is to, me ſome argument that it lies ſo open to the objections even of common ſpirits, that the Compilers of it did intend more to prevaile by the ſucceſſe of their Armies, then the ſtrength of reaſon, and the proper grounds of perſwaſion, which yet moſt wiſe and good men believe to be the more Chriſtian way of the two. But Sir, you have engaged me to ſay ſomething in particular to ſatisfie your conſcience. In which alſo I deſire I may reſerve a leave to my ſelf to conceal much, if I may in little doe you ſatisfaction.

Numb. 2. I ſhall therefore decline to ſpeak of the Efficient cauſe of this Directory, and not quarrell at it that is was compoſed, againſt the Lawes both of *England* and all Chriſtendome. If the thing were good and pious, I ſhould learn to ſubmit to the impoſition, and never quarrell at the incompetency of his authority that engaged me to doe pious and holy things. And it may be when I am a little more uſed to it, I ſhall not wonder at a Synod, in which not one Biſhop ſits (in the capacity of a Biſhop) though I am moſt certain this is the firſt example in *England*, ſince it was firſt Chriſtned. But for preſent it ſeemes ſomething hard to digeſt it, becauſe I know ſo well that all Aſſemblies of the Church have admitted Prieſts to conſultation and diſpute, but never to authority and deciſion, till the Pope enlarging the phylacteries of the Archimandrites and Abbots, did ſometimes by way of priviledge and diſpenſation give to ſome of them deciſive voyces in publike Councels. But this was one of the things in which he did innovate and invade againſt the publike reſolutions of Chriſtendome, though he durſt not doe it often, and when he did it, it was in very ſmall and inconſiderate numbers.

Numb. 3. I ſaid I would not meddle with the Efficient, and I cannot meddle with the Finall cauſe, nor gueſſe at any other ends and purpoſes of theirs then at what they publiquely profeſſe, which is the abolition and deſtruction of the Book of Common-Prayer; which great change, becauſe they are pleaſed to call Reformation, I am content in charity to believe they think it ſo, and that they have *Zelum Dei*, but whether *ſecundum ſcientiam*, according to knowledge or no, muſt be judged by them who conſider the matter and the forme.

Numb. 4. But becauſe the matter is of ſo great variety and minute conſideration, every part whereof would require as much ſcrutiny as I purpoſe to beſtow upon the whole, I have for the preſent choſen to conſider only the form of it; and becauſe it pretends againſt the form of ſet Lyturgy: and that *ex tempore* forms doe ſucceed in room of the eſtabliſhed and determined ſervices, I ſhall give you my judgement of it, without any ſharpneſſe or bitterneſſe of ſpirit, for I am reſolved not

to

to be angry with any man of another perſwaſion, as knowing that I differ juſt as much from them as they doe from me.

And firſt, I conſider that the true ſtate of the Queſtion is only this, Whether it is better to pray to God with conſideration or without? whether is the wiſer man of the two, hee who thinks, and deliberates what to ſay, or he that utters his mind as faſt as it comes? Whether is the better man, he who out of reverence to God is moſt careſull and curious that he offend not in his tongue, and therefore he himſelfe deliberates and takes the beſt guides he can, or he who out of the confidence of his own abilities or other exteriour aſſiſtances, ſpeaks what ever comes uppermoſt? *Numb.* 5.

And here I have the advice and councell of a very wiſe man, no leſſe than *Solomon*, *Eccleſ.* 5. 2. *Be not raſh with thy mouth, and let not thy heart be haſty to utter any thing before God, for God is in heaven and thou upon earth, therefore, let thy words be few.* The conſideration of the vaſt diſtance between God and us, Heaven and Earth, ſhould create ſuch apprehenſions in us, that the very beſt and choyceſt of our offertoryes are not acceptable but by Gods gracious vouchſafeing and condeſcenſion: and therefore ſince we are ſo much indebted to God for accepting our beſt, it is not ſafe ventured to preſent him with a dowbaked ſacrifice, and put him off with that which in nature and humane conſideration is abſolutely the worſt; for ſuch is all the crude and imperfect utterance of our more imperfect conceptions. But let *Solomons* reaſon be what it will, good we are ſure it is. Let us conſider who keeps the precept beſt; He that deliberates, or he that conſiders not but when he ſpeakes: What man in the world is haſty *to offer any thing before God*, if he bee not who prayes *ex tempore*? And then adde to it but the weight of *Solomons* reaſon, and let any man anſwer me if he thinks it can well ſtand with that reverence we owe to the Immenſe, the infinite, and to the eternall God, the God of wiſdome, to offer him a ſacrifice which we durſt not preſent to a Prince, or a prudent Governour in *reſeriâ*, ſuch as our prayers ought to be. *Numb.* 6.

And that this may not be daſhed with a pretence it is carnall reaſoning, *Numb.* 7.

reaſoning I deſire it may be remembred, that it is the argument God himſelfe uſes againſt lame, maimed, and imperfect ſacrifices, *Goe and offer this to thy Prince*, ſee if he will accept it: Implying, that the beſt perſon is to have the beſt preſent; and what the Prince will ſlight as truly unworthy of him, much more is it unfit for God. For God accepts not of any thing we give or doe, as if he were bettred by it: for therefore its eſtimate is not taken by its relation or naturall complacency to him, it is all alike to him, for in it ſelfe it is to him as nothing. But God accepts it by its proportion, and commenſuration to us. That which we call our beſt, and is truly ſo in humane eſtimate, that pleaſes God, for it declares, that if we had better, we would give it him. But to reſerve the beſt, ſayes too plainly, that we think any thing is good enough for him. As therefore God in the Law would not be ſerved by that which was imperfect in *genere naturæ*: ſo neither now nor ever will that pleaſe him which is imperfect in *genere morum*, or *materiâ intellectuali*, when we can give a better.

Numb. 8. Well then, in the nature of the thing, *ex tempore* forms have much the worſe of it. But it is pretended that there is ſuch a thing as the gift of Prayer, a praying with the Spirit, *Et neſcit tarda molimina ſpiritus ſancti gratia.* Gods Spirit (if he pleaſes) can doe his work as well in an inſtant, as in long premeditation. And to this purpoſe are pretended thoſe places of Scripture which ſpeak of the aſſiſtance of Gods Spirit in our prayers, *Zech.* 12. 10. *And I will poure upon the houſe of* David, *and the inhabitants of Jeruſalem, the ſpirit of grace and ſupplication.* But eſpecially *Rom.* 8. 26. *Likewiſe the Spirit alſo helpeth our infirmities; for we know not what we ſhould pray for as we ought, but the Spirit it ſelfe maketh interceſſion for us with groanings that cannot be uttered, &c.* From whence the Concluſion that is inferred is in the words of Saint *Paul*, *That we muſt pray with the ſpirit*, therefore not with ſet forms, therefore *ex tempore*.

Numb. 9. The Collection is ſomewhat wild; for there is great independence in the ſeverall parts, and much more is in the Concluſion, then was virtually in the premiſes. But ſuch as it is, the Authors

Authors of it I suppose will own it. And therefore we will examine the maine design of it, and then consider the particular meanes of its perswasion, quoted in the objection.

It is one of the priviledges of the Gospel, and the benefit of Christs ascension, that the holy Ghost is given unto the Church, and is become to us the fountaine of gifts and graces. But these gifts and graces are improvements and helps of our naturall faculties, of our art and industry, not extraordinary, miraculous, and immediate infusions of habits and gifts. That without Gods Spirit we cannot pray aright; that our infirmities need his help; that we know not what to ask of our selves, is most true: and if ever any Heretique was more confident of his own naturals, or did ever more undervalue Gods grace then ever the *Pelagians* did, yet he denyes not this. But what then? Therefore without study, without art, without premeditation, without learning, the spirit gives the gift of prayer, and it is his grace, that without any naturall or artificiall help makes us pray *ex tempore?* No such thing: The Objection proves nothing of this. *Numb.* 10.

Here therefore we will joyn issue, whether the gifts and helps of the Spirit be immediate infusions of the Faculties, and powers, and perfect abilities? Or that he doth assist us only by his aydes externall and internall, in the use of such means which God and nature hath given to man, to ennoble his soul, better his Faculties, and to improve his understanding? That the aydes of the holy Ghost are only assistances to us in the use of naturall and artificiall means, I will undertake to prove, and from thence it will evidently follow, that labour, and hard study, and premeditation will soonest purchase the gift of prayer, and ascertain us of the assistance of the spirit; and therefore set forms of prayer, studyed and considered of, are in a true and proper sense, and without enthusiasm, the fruits of the spirit. *Numb.* 11.

1. Gods Spirit did assist the Apostles by wayes extraordinary, and fit for the first institution of Christianity: but doth assist us now by the expresses of those first assistances which he gave to them immediately. So that the holy Ghost is the author of our faith, and we believe with the spirit (it is Saint *Pauls* expression) *Numb.* 12.

preſſion) and yet our beliefe comes by hearing and reading the holy Scriptures and their interpretations. Now reconcile theſe two together, Faith comes by hearing, and yet is the gift of the Spirit, and it ſayes, that the gifts of the Spirit are not extaſies, and immediate infuſions of habits, but helps from God to enable us upon the uſe of the meanes of his own appointment to believe, to ſpeak, to underſtand, to prophecy, and to pray.

Numb. 13. 2. And that theſe are for this reaſon called gifts, and graces, and iſſues of the Spirit, is ſo evident and notorious, that the ſpeaking of an ordinary revealed truth, is called in Scripture *a ſpeaking by the Spirit*, 1 Cor. 12. 8. *No man can ſay that Jeſus is the Lord, but by the holy Ghoſt.* For if the holy Ghoſt ſupplyes us with materials, and fundamentals for our building, it is then enough to denominate the whole edifice to be of him, although the labour and the workmanſhip be ours, upon anothers ſtock. And this is it which the Apoſtles ſpeaks, 1 *Cor.* 2. 13. *Which things alſo we ſpeak, not in the words which mans wiſdome teacheth, but which the holy Ghoſt teacheth, comparing ſpirituall things with ſpirituall.* The holy Ghoſt teaches, yet it is upon our co-operation, our ſtudy and endeavour, while we compare ſpirituall things with ſpirituall; the holy Ghoſt is ſaid to teach us, becauſe theſe ſpirituals were of his ſuggeſtion and revelation.

Vid. Act. 19. 21. Act. 16. 7, 9, 10.

Numb. 11. 3. For it is a rule of the Schools, and there is much reaſon in it, *Habitus infuſi infunduntur per modum acquiſitorum*, whatſoever is infuſed into us, is in the ſame manner infuſed as other things are acquired, that is, ſtep by ſtep, by humane meanes and co-operation, and grace does not give us new faculties, and create another nature, but meliorates and improves our own. And what S. *Paul* ſaid in the Reſurrection, is alſo true in this Queſtion, *That is not firſt which is ſpirituall, but that which is naturall, and then that which is ſpirituall.* The graces and gifts of the Spirit are poſtnate, and are additions to art and nature. God directs our councels, opens our underſtandings, regulates our will, orders our affections, ſupplies us with Objects, and Arguments, and opportunities, and revelations *in ſcriptis*, and then moſt when we moſt imploy our own endeavours,

deavours, God loving to bleſſe all the meanes, and inſtruments of his ſervice, whether they be naturall or acquiſite.

But whoſoever ſhall look for any other gifts of the ſpirit beſides the parts of nature helped by induſtry and Gods bleſſing upon it, and the revelations or the ſuppplyes of matter in holy Scripture, will be very farre to ſeek, having neither reaſon, promiſe, nor experience of his ſide. For why ſhould the ſpirit of Prayer be any other than as the gift and ſpirit of faith (as S. *Paul* calls it, 2 *Cor.* 4. 13) acquired by humane meanes uſing divine aids? that is, by our endeavours in hearing, reading, Catechizing, deſires to obey, and all this bleſſed and promoted by God, this produces faith. And if the ſpirit of Prayer be of greater conſequence, and hath a promiſe of a ſpeciall prerogative, let the firſt be proved, and the ſecond be ſhewn in any good record, and then I will believe it too. *Numb.* 15.

4. And the parallel of this Argument I the rather urge, becauſe I find praying in the holy Ghoſt joyned with graces, which are as much Gods gifts and productions of the ſpirit as any thing in the world, and yet which the Apoſtle preſſes upon us as duties and things put into our power, and to be improved by our induſtry, and thoſe are faith (in which I before inſtanced) and charity, *Epiſt. Jud. ver.* 20. *But ye (beloved) building up your ſelves on your moſt holy Faith, praying in the holy Ghoſt, keep your ſelves in the love of God.* All of the ſame conſideration, Faith, and Prayer and Charity, all gifts of the Spirit, and yet build up your ſelves in faith, and keep your ſelves in love, and therefore by a parity of reaſon, improve your ſelves in the ſpirit of prayer, that is, God by his Spirit having ſupplyed us with matter, let our induſtry and co-operations *per modum naturæ*, improve theſe gifts, and build upon this foundation. *Numb.* 16.

So that in effect, praying in the holy Ghoſt or with the Spirit, is nothing but prayer for ſuch things and in ſuch manner which God by his Spirit hath taught us in holy Scripture. Holy prayers, ſpirituall ſongs, ſo the Apoſtle calls one part of prayer, *viz.* Eucharisticall or thankſgiving, that is, prayers or ſongs which are ſpirituall *in materiâ*. And if they be called ſpirituall for the efficient cauſe too, the holy Ghoſt being the Author of them, it comes all to one, for therefore he is the cauſe and giver of them, *Numb.* 17.

because he hath in his word revealed, what things we are to pray for, and there also hath taught us the manner.

Numb. 18. And this is exactly the Doctrine I plainly gather from the objected words of Saint *Paul*, (*The Spirit helpeth our infirmities*) How so? it followes immediately, *For we know not what we should pray for as we ought*: So that therefore he is the Spirit of supplication and prayer, because he teaches us what to ask, and how to pray, so he helps our infirmities, συναντιλαμβάνεται, it is in the Greek *Collaborantem adjuvat*. It is an ingeminate expression of helping us in our labours together with him. Now he that shall say this is not sufficiently done by Gods Spirit in Scripture by Prayers, and Psalmes, and Hymnes, and Spirituall Songs, and precepts concerning prayer, set down in that holy repository of truth and devotion, undervalues that ineſtimable treasure of the Spirit; and if it be sufficiently done there, he that will multiply his hopes farther, then what is sufficient, may possibly deceive himself, but never deceive God, and make him multiply and continue miracles, to justifie his fancy.

Numb. 19. 5. Better it is to follow the Scriptures for our guide, as in all things else, so in this particular, *Ephes.*6.17,18. *Take the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God. Praying alwayes with all prayer and supplication in the spirit.* The Word of God is the sword of the Spirit; praying in the Spirit is one way of using it, indeed the only way that he here specifies. Praying in the Spirit then being the using of this Sword, and this Sword being the Word of God, it followes evidently, that praying in the Spirit, is praying in or according to the Word of God, that is, in the directions, rules and expresses of the Word of God, that is, of the holy Scriptures.

Numb. 20. The summe is this. Whatsoever this gift is, or this Spirit of Prayer, it is to be acquired by humane industry, by learning of the Scriptures, by reading, by conference, and by whatsoever else faculties are improved, and habits enlarged. Gods Spirit hath done his work sufficiently this way, and he loves not either in nature or grace (which are his two great sanctions) to multiply miracles when there is no need.

Numb. 21. 6. So that now I demand, Whether or no, since the expiration of the Age of Miracles, does not Gods Spirit most assist us, when we

we moſt endeavour and moſt uſe the meanes? He that ſayes, No, diſcourages all men from reading the Scriptures, from induſtry, from meditation, from conference, from humane Arts and Sciences, and from whatſoever elſe God and good Lawes provoke us to by propoſition of rewards: But if, Yea, (as moſt certainly God will beſt crown the beſt endeavours) then the ſpirit of Prayer is greateſt in him, who (ſuppoſing the like capacities and opportunities) ſtudies hardeſt, reads moſt, practices moſt religiouſly, deliberates moſt prudently; and then by how much want of meanes is worſe then the uſe of meanes, by ſo much *ex tempore* Prayers are worſe then deliberate and ſtudyed. Excellent therefore is the councell of S. *Peter*, 1 *Ep. Chap.* 4. *ver.* 11. *If any man ſpeak, let him ſpeak as the Oracles of God*, (not lightly then and inconſiderately) *If any man miniſter, let him doe it as of the ability which God giveth*: (great reaſon then to put all his abilities and faculties to it) and whether of the two does moſt likely doe that, he that takes paines, and conſiders, and diſcuſſes, and ſo approves and practiſes a form, or he that never conſiders what he ſayes, till hee ſayes it, needs not much deliberation to paſſe a ſentence.

7. Laſtly, did not the Penmen of the Scripture, write the Epiſtles and Goſpels reſpectively all by the Spirit? Moſt certainly, holy men of God *ſpoke as they were moved by the holy Ghoſt*, ſaith Saint *Peter*. And certainly they were moved by a more immediate motion, and a motion nearer to an Enthuſiaſme, then now adayes in the gift and ſpirit of Prayer. And yet in the midſt of thoſe great aſſiſtances and motions they did uſe ſtudy, art, induſtry, and humane abilities. This is more then probable in the different ſtyles of the ſeverall Books, ſome being of admirable art, others lower and plaine. The words were their own, at leaſt ſometimes, not the holy Ghoſts. And if the Fathers and Grammarians were not deceived by falſe Copies, but that they truly did obſerve, ſometimes to be propriety of expreſſion in the language, ſometimes not true Greek, who will think thoſe errours or imperfections in Grammar, were (in reſpect of the words I ſay preciſely) immediate inſpirations and dictates of the holy Ghoſt, and not rather their own productions of induſtry and humanity? But clearely ſome of their words were the words *Numb.* 22.

of *Aratus*, some of *Epimenides*, some of *Menander*, some of Saint *Paul*, [*This speak I, not the Lord,* 1 *Cor.* 7.] and yet because the holy Ghost renewed their memory, improved their understanding, and supplyed to some their want of humane learning, and so assisted them that they should not commit an errour in fact or opinion, neither in the narrative nor dogmaticall parts, therefore they writ by the Spirit. Since then we cannot pretend upon any grounds of probability to an inspiration so immediate as theirs, and yet their assistances which they had from the Spirit did not exclude humane arts, and industry, but that the ablest Scholler did write the best, much rather is this true in the gifts and assistances we receive, and particularly in the gift of Prayer, it is not an *ex tempore* and an inspired faculty, but the faculties of nature and the abilities of art and industry are improved and ennobled by the supervening assistances of the Spirit.

Numb. 23. And now let us take a man that pretends he hath the gift of Prayer, and loves to pray *ex tempore*, I suppose his thoughts goe a little before his tongue; I demand then, Whether cannot this man, when it is once come into his head, hold his tongue, and write down what he hath conceived? If his first conceptions were of God, and Gods Spirit, then they are so still, even when they are written. Or is the Spirit departed from him, upon the sight of a pen and Ink-horn? It did use to be otherwise among the old and new Prophets, whether they were Prophets of Prediction, or of ordinary Ministery. But if his conception may be written, and being written is still a production of the Spirit, then it follows that set-forms of Prayer deliberate and described, may as well be a praying with the Spirit, as sudden forms and *ex tempore* out-lets.

Numb. 24. Now the case being thus put, I would faine know what the difference is between deliberate and *ex tempore* Prayers, save only that in these there is lesse consideration and prudence; for that the other are (at least as much as them) the productions of the Spirit, is evident in the very case put in this very Argument: and whether to consider and to weigh them, be any disadvantage to our devotions, I leave it to all wise men to determine. So that in effect, since after the pretended assistance of the Spirit

in

in our Prayers, we may write them down, consider them, try the spirits, and ponder the manner, the reason and the religion of the addresse; let the world judge whether this sudden utterance and *ex tempore* forms be any thing else, but a direct resolution not to consider before-hand what we speak.

But let us look a little further into the mystery, and see what is meant in Scripture by *praying with the Spirit*. In what sense the holy Ghost is called the *spirit of Prayer*, I have already shewn, *viz.* by the same reason, as he is the *spirit of faith*, of *prudence*, of *knowledge*, of *understanding*, and the like. But *praying with the spirit* hath besides this other senses also in Scripture. I finde in one place, that then we pray with the Spirit, when the holy Ghost does actually excite us to desires and earnest tendencies to the obtaining our holy purposes, when he gives us zeale and devotion, charity and fervour, spirituall violence and holy importunity. This sense is also in the latter part of the objected words of Saint *Paul*, *Rom.*8. *The Spirit it selfe maketh intercession for us with groanings, &c.* Indeed this is truly a praying in the spirit; but this will doe our reverend Brethren of the Assembly little advantage as to the present Question. For this spirit is not a spirit of utterance; not at all clamorous in the eares of the people, but cryes loud in the eares of God with [*groanes unutterable*] so it followes, and only [*He that searcheth the heart, he understandeth the meaning of the spirit.*] This is the spirit of the Son, which God hath sent into our hearts, (not into our tongues) whereby we cry, *Abba*, Father, *Gal.*4.6. And this is the great ἀυθεντία for mentall Prayer, which is properly and truly praying by the Spirit. *Numb.* 25.

Another praying with the Spirit I find in that place of S. *Paul*, from whence this expression is taken, and commonly used, *I will pray with the spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also.* Here they are opposed, or at least declared to be things severall and disparate: where by the way observe, that praying with the spirit, even in sense of Scripture, is not alwayes most to edification of the people. Not alwayes with understanding. And when these two are separated, St *Paul* prefers five words with understanding, before ten thousand in the spirit. For this praying with the spirit was indeed then a gift extraordinary and miraculous, *Numb.* 26.

like as propheeying with the spirit, and expired with it. But while it did last, it was the lowest of gifts, *Inter dona linguarum*, it was but a gift of the tongue, and not to be the benefit of the Church directly or immediately.

Numb. 27. By the way only. If Saint *Paul* did so undervalve the praying with the Spirit, that he preferred edifying the Church a thousand degrees beyond it. I suppose he would have been of the same mind, if this Question had been between praying with the Spirit and obeying our superiors, as he was when it was between praying with the Spirit and edification of the Church, because (if I be not mistaken) it is matter of great concernment towards the edification of the Church to obey our superiours, not to innovate in publick formes of worship, especially with the scandall and offence of very wise and learned men, and to the disgrace of the dead Martyrs, who sealed our Liturgy with their blood.

Numb. 28. But to return. In this place praying with the Spirit, is no more then my spirit praying. For so S. *Paul* joynes them as terms identicall, and expressive one of anothers meaning, as you may please to read *ver.* 14, and 15. 1 *Cor.* 14. *I will pray with the Spirit, and my Spirit truly prayeth.* It is the act of our inner man, praying holy and spirituall Prayers. But then indeed at that time there was something extraordinary joyned, for it was in an unknown tongue, the practice of which S. *Paul* there dislikes. This also will be to none of their purposes. For whether it were *ex tempore*, or by premeditation, is not here expressed; or if it had, yet that assistance extraordinary in prayer, if there was any beside the gift of tongues (which I much doubt) is no more transmitted to us, then the speaking tongues in the spirit, or propheeyirg *ex tempore* and by the spirit.

Numb. 29. But I would adde also one experiment which S. *Paul* also there addes by way of instance. If praying with the spirit in this place be praying *ex tempore*, then so is singing too. For they are expressed in the same place, in the same manner, to the same end, and I know no reason why there should be differing senses put upon them to serve purposes. And now let us have some Church-musick too, though the Organs be pulled down, and let any the best Psalmist of them all, compose a hymne in metricall forme, and

and ſing it to a new tune with perfect and true muſick, and all this *ex tempore.* For all this the holy Ghoſt can doe if he pleaſes. But if it be ſaid that the *Corinthian* Chriſtians compoſed their ſongs and hymnes according to art and rules of muſick, by ſtudy and induſtry, and that to this they were aſſiſted by the Spirit; and that this together with the devotion of their ſpirit, was ſinging with the ſpirit, then ſay I, ſo compoſing ſet forms of Lyturgy by skill and prudence, and humane induſtry, may be as much praying with the ſpirit as the other is ſinging with the ſpirit. Plainly enough. In all the ſenſes of praying with the ſpirit, and in all its acceptations in Scripture, to pray or ſing with the ſpirit, neither of them of neceſſity implyes *ex tempore.*

The ſumme or *Collecta* of the premiſes is this, Praying with the ſpirit, is either when the ſpirit ſtirres up our deſires to pray, *Per motionem actualis auxilii*, or when the ſpirit teaches us what, or how to pray, telling us the matter, and manner of our prayers. Or laſtly, dictating the very words of our prayers. There is no other way in the world to pray with the ſpirit, or in the holy Ghoſt, that is pertinent to this Queſtion. And of this laſt manner the Scripture determines nothing, nor ſpeaks any thing expreſſely of it, and yet ſuppoſe it had, we are certaine the holy Ghoſt hath ſupplyed us with all theſe, and yet in ſet formes of prayer beſt of all, I meane there where a difference can be. For as for the deſires, and actuall motions or incitements to pray, they are indifferent to one or the other, to ſet-forms or to *ex tempore.* 2. But as to the matter and manner of prayer, it is clearly contained in the expreſſes, and ſet forms of Scriptures, and it is ſupplyed to us by the ſpirit, for he is the great Dictaror of it. *Numb.* 30.

Now then for the very words. No man can aſſure me that the words of his *ex tempore* prayer are the words of the holy Spirit: it is not reaſon nor modeſty to expect ſuch immediate aſſiſtances to ſo little purpoſe, he having ſupplyed us with abilities more then enough to expreſſe our deſires *aliunde*, otherwiſe then by immediate dictate. But if we will take *Davids* Pſalter, or the other hymnes of holy Scripture, or any of the Prayers which are reſperſed over the Bible, we are ſure enough that they are the words of Gods Spirit, mediately or immediately, by way of infuſion or extaſie, by viſion, or at leaſt by ordinary aſſiſtance. And *Numb.* 31.

now

now then, what greater confidence can any man have for the excellency of his Prayer, and the probability of their being accepted, then when he prayes his Psalter, or the Lords Prayer, or another office which he finds consigned in Scripture? When Gods Spirit stirs us up to an actuall devotion, and then we use the matter hee hath described and taught, and the very words which Christ, and Christs Spirit, and the Apostles, and other persons full of the holy Ghost did use; if in the world there be any praying with the Spirit, (I mean in vocall prayer) this is it.

And thus I have examined the intire and full scope of this Question, and rifled their Objection. Now I shall proceed to some few Arguments which are more extrinsecall to the nature of the thing.

Numb. 32. It is a practice prevailing among those of our Brethren that are zealous for *ex tempore* prayers, to pray their Sermons over, to reduce their doctrine into Devotion and Lyturgy. I mislike it not for the thing it selfe, if it were done regularly for the manner, and the matter were alwayes pious and true. But who shall assure me when the preacher hath disputed, or rather dogmatically decreed a point of predestination, or of prescience, of contingency, or of liberty, or any of the most mysterious parts of Divinity, and then prayes his Sermon over, that he then prayes with the Spirit? Unlesse I be sure that he also preached with the Spirit, I cannot be sure that he prayes with the spirit, for all he prayes *ex tempore*. Nay, if I heare a Protestant preach in the morning, and an Anabaptist in the afternoone, to day a Presbyterian, to morrow an Independent, am I not most sure that when they have preached Contradictories, and all of them pray their Sermons over, that they doe not all pray with the spirit? More than one in this case cannot pray with the spirit, possibly all may pray against him.

Numb. 33. 2. From whence I thus argue in behalfe of set forms of prayer. That in the case above put, how shall I or any man else say Amen to their prayers that preach and pray contradictories? At least I am much hindred in my devotion. For besides that, it derives our opinions into our devotions, makes every schoole point become our religion, and makes God a party, (so farre as we can) intitling him to our impertinent wranglings. Besides this,

this, I ſay, while we ſhould attend to our addreſſes towards God, we are to conſider whether the point be true or no, and by that time we have tacitly diſcourſed it, we are upon another point which alſo perhaps is as Queſtionable as the former, and by this time our ſpirit of devotion is a little diſcompoſed and ſomething out of countenance, there is ſo much other imployment for the ſpirit, the ſpirit of diſcerning and judging. All which inconveniences are avoyded in ſet formes of Liturgy. For we know before hand the conditions of our Communion, and to what we are to ſay Amen, to which if we like it we may repaire; if not, there is no harm done; your devotion ſhall not be ſurprized, nor your Communion invaded, as it may be and often is in your *ex tempore* prayers. And this thing hath another collaterall inconvenience, which is of great conſideration; for upon what confidence can we ſollicite any Recuſants to come to our Church, where we cannot promiſe them that the devotions there to be uſed, ſhall be innocent, nor can we put him into a condition to judge for himſelfe? If hee will venture he may, but we can uſe no Argument to make him chooſe our Churches, though he ſhould quit his own.

3. But again, let us conſider with ſobriety. Are not thoſe prayers and hymnes in holy Scripture, excellent compoſitions, admirable inſtruments of devotion, full of piety, rare and incomparable addreſſes to God? Dare any man with his gift of prayer pretend, that he can *ex tempore* or by ſtudy make better? Who dares pretend that he hath a better ſpirit then *David* had, or then the Apoſtles and Prophets, and other holy perſons in Scripture, whoſe Prayers and Pſalmes are by Gods Spirit conſigned to the uſe of the Church for ever? Or will it be denyed but that they alſo are excellent directories and patterns for prayer? And if patterns, the neare we draw to our example, are not the imitations and repreſentments the better? And what then if we took the ſamplers themſelves, is there any imperfection in them, and can we mend them and correct *Magnificat*? *Numb.* 34.

In a juſt porportion and commenſuration, I argue ſo concerning the primitive and ancient forms of Church ſervice, which are compoſed according to thoſe ſo excellent patterns, which if they had remained pure as in their firſt inſtitution, or had alwayes been *Numb.* 35.

as they have been reformed by the Church of *England*, they would againſt all defiance put in for the next place to thoſe formes or Liturgy which *Mutatis mutandis* are nothing but the Words of Scripture. But I am reſolved at this preſent not to enter into Queſtion concerning the matter of prayers. But for the forme this I ſay further.

Numb. 36. 4. That the Church of God hath the promiſe of the ſpirit made to her in generall, to her in her Catholick and united capacity, to the whole Church firſt, then to particular Churches, then in the loweſt ſeat of the Category to ſingle perſons. Now then I infer, if any ſingle perſons will have us to believe without all poſſibility of prooſe (for ſo it muſt be) that they pray with the Spirit, (for how ſhall they be able to prove the ſpirit actually to abide in thoſe ſingle perſons) then much rather muſt we believe it of the Church, which by how much the more generall it is, ſo much the more of the ſpirit ſhe is likely to have; and then if there be no errours in the matter, the Church hath the advantage and probability on her ſide, and if there be an errour in matter in either of them, they faile of their preſences, neither of them have the ſpirit. But the publick ſpirit in all reaſon is to be truſted before the private, when there is a conteſtation, the Church being *Prior & potior in promiſſis*, ſhe hath a greater and *prior* title to the ſpirit. And why the Church hath not the ſpirit of prayer in her compoſitions as well as any of her children, I deſire once for all to be ſatisfied upon true grounds either of reaſon or revelation.

Numb. 37. 5. Or if the Church ſhall be admitted to have the gift, and the ſpirit of prayer given unto her by virtue of the great promiſe of the ſpirit, to abide with her for ever, yet for all this ſhe is taught to pray in a ſet form of prayer, and yet by the ſpirit too. For what think we? When Chriſt taught us to pray in that incomparable modell, the Lords Prayer, if we pray that prayer devoutly, and with pious and actuall intention, doe we not pray in the Spirit of Chriſt, as much as if we prayed any other form of words pretended to be taught us by the Spirit? Wee are ſure that Chriſt and Chriſts Spirit taught us this Prayer; they only gather by conjectures and opinions, that in their *ex tempore* forms the ſpirit of Chriſt teaches them. So much then as

cert[illegible]inties

certainties are better then uncertaines, and God above man, ſo much is this ſet form (beſides the infinite advantages in the matter) better then their *ex tempore* forms in the form it ſelfe.

6. If I ſhould deſcend to minutes and particulars, I could inſtance in the behalfe of ſet forms, that God preſcribed to *Moſes* a ſet form of prayer and benediction to be uſed when he did bleſſe the people. 7. That *Moſes* compoſed a ſong or hymne for the children of Iſrael to uſe to all their generations. 8. That *David* compoſed many for the ſervice of the tabernacle. 9. That *Solomon* and the holy Kings of *Judah* brought them in and continued them in the miniſtration of the temple. 10. That all Scripture is written for our learning, and ſince all theſe and many more ſet forms of prayer are left there upon record, it is more then probable that they were left there for our uſe and devotion. 11. That S. *John* Baptiſt taught his Diſciples a forme of prayer. 12. And that Chriſts Diſciples begged the ſame favour, and it was granted as they deſired it. 13. And that Chriſt gave it not only *in maſſâ materiæ*, but *in forma verborum*; not in a confuſed heap of matter, but in an exact compoſure of words, it makes it evident, he intended it not only *pro regula petendorum*, for a direction of what things we are to ask, but alſo *pro forma orationis*, for a ſet form of Prayer. In which alſo I am moſt certainly confirmed (beſides the univerſall teſtimony of Gods Church ſo atteſting it) in the precept which Chriſt added, *When ye pray, pray after this manner*: and indeed it points not the matter only of our prayers, but the form of it, the manner and the matter of the addreſſe both. But in the repetition of it by Saint *Luke*, the preceptive words ſeeme to limit us, and direct us to this very form of words, *When ye pray, ſay, Our Father, &c.* 14. I could alſo adde the example of all the Jewes, and by conſequence of our bleſſed Saviour, who ſung a great part of *Davids* Pſalter in their feaſt of Paſſeover, which part is called by the Iewes the great *Hallelujah*, it begins at the 113 Pſalm, and ends at the 118 incluſively. And the Scripture mentions it as part of our bleſſed Saviours devotion, and of his Diſciples, that they ſung a Pſalme. 15. That this afterward became a Precept Evangelicall, that we ſhould praiſe God in Hymnes, Pſalmes, and ſpirituall Songs, which is a form of Liturgy, in *Numb.* 38.

which we sing with the spirit, but yet cannot make our Hymnes *ex tempore*, (it would be wild stuffe if we should goe about it.)

16. And lastly, that a set form of worship and addresse to God
Apoc. 15. was recorded by Saint *John*, and sung in heaven, and it was composed out of the songs of *Moses*, (*Exod.*15.) of *David*, *Psal.*145.) and of *Jeremy*, (*Chap.*10.6,7.) which certainly is a very good precedent for us to imitate, although but revealed to Saint *John* by way of vision and extasie. All which and many more are to me as so many Arguments of the use, excellency, and necessity of set forms of Prayer for publick Liturgies, and of greatest conveniencie, even for private devotions.

Numb. 39. 17. And so the Church of God in all Ages did understand it. I shall not multiply Authorities to this purpose, for they are too many and various; but shall only observe two great instances of their beliefe and practise in this particular. 1. The one is the perpetuall use and great Eulogies of the Lords Prayer, assisted by the many Commentaries of the Fathers upon it. 2. The other is that solemn form of benediction and mysticall prayer (as Saint *Augustine* calls it, *Lib.*3. *de Trinit.c.*4.) which all Churches (and themselves said it was by Ordinance Apostolicall) used in the Consecration of the blessed Sacrament. But all of them used the Lords Prayer in the Canon, and office of Consecration, and other prayers taken from Scripture, (so *Justin Martyr* testifies, that the Consecration is made *per preces verbi Dei*, by the prayers taken from the Word of God) and the whole Canon was short, determined and mysterious.

Numb. 40. Who desires to be further satisfied in this particular, shall find enough in *Walafridus Strabo*, *Aymonius*, *Cassander*, *Flacius Illyricus*, *Josephus Vicecomes*, and the other Ritualists, and in the old offices themselves. So that I need not put you in mind of that famous doxology of *Gloria Patria*, *&c.* nor the *Trisagion*, nor any of those memorable hymnes used in the Ancient Church, so knownly and frequently, that the beginning of them came to bee their name, and they were known more by their own words, then the Authors inscription.

Numb. 41. At last when some men that thought themselves better gifted would be venturing at conceived formes of their own, there was a timely restraint made in the Councell of *Milevis* in *Africa*,

Africa, Placuit ut preces quæ probatæ fuerint in Concilio ab omnibus celebrentur, nec aliæ omnino dicantur in Ecclesia, nisi quæ à prudentioribus factæ fuerint in Synodo. That's the restraint and prohibition, publick prayers must be such as are publickly appointed, and prescribed by our Superiours; and no private forms of our conceiving must be used in the Church. The reason followes, *Ne forte aliquid contra fidem, vel per ignorantiam, vel per minus studium sit compositum:* Lest through ignorance or want of deliberation any thing be spoken in our prayers against faith [and good manners.] The reason is good, and they are eare-witnesses of it that hear the variety of prayers before and after Sermons, there, where the Directory is practised, where (to speak most modestly) not only their private opinions, but also humane interests, and their own personall concernments, and wild fancies, born perhaps not two dayes before, are made the objects of the peoples hopes, of their desires, and their prayers, and all in the meane time pretend to the holy Spirit.

I will not now instance in the vaine-glory that is appendant to these *ex tempore* formes of prayer, where the gift of the man is more then the devotion of the man: nor will I consider that then his gift is best, when his prayer is longest: and if he take a complacency in his gift (as who is not apt to doe it?) he will be sure to extend his Prayer, till a suspicious and scrupulous man would be apt to say, his prayer pressed hard upon that which our blessed Saviour reprehended in the Pharisees, who thought to bee heard for their much babling. But these things are accidentall to the nature of the thing. And therefore though they are too certainly consequent to the person, yet I will not be too severe, but preserve my selfe on the surer side of charitable construction, which truly I desire to keep, nor only to their persons whom I much reverence, but also to their actions. But yet I durst not doe the same thing, even for these last reasons, though I had no other. *Numb.* 42.

But it is objected, that in set forms of Prayer, we restrain and confine the blessed Spirit; and in conceived forms, when every man is left to his liberty, then the Spirit is free, unlimited and unconstrained. *Numb.* 43.

I answer, either their conceived formes (I use their own words, though *Numb.* 44.

though indeed the expression is very inartificiall) are premeditate and described or they are *ex tempore*. If they be premeditate and described, then the Spirit is as much limited in their conceived forms as in the Churches conceived forms. For as to this particular, it is all one who describes and limits the form, whether the Church, or a single man does it, still the Spirit is in constraint and limit. So that in this case they are not angry at set forms of Prayer, but that they do not make them. And if it be replyed, that if a single person composes a set form, he may alter it if he please, and so his spirit is at liberty. I answer, so may the Church, if she see cause for it: and unlesse there be cause, the single person will not alter it, unlesse he do things unreasonable and without cause. So that it will be an unequall and a peevish quarrell to allow of set forms of prayer made by private persons, and not of set forms made by the publick spirit of the Church. It is evident, that the Spirit is limited in both alike.

Numb. 45. But if by [*Conceived forms*] in this objection they meane *ex tempore* prayers (for so they most generally practice it) and that in the use of these the liberty of the spirit is best preserved. To this I answer, that the being *ex tempore* or premeditate will be wholly impertinent to this Question of limiting the spirit. For there may be great liberty in set forms, even when there is much variety; and there may be great restraint in *ex tempore* prayers, even then when it shall be called unlawfull to use set forms. That the spirit is restrained, or that it is free in either, is accidentall to them both; for it may be either free or not free; in both as it may happen.

Numb. 46. But the restraint is this, that every one is not left to his liberty to pray how he list, (with premeditation or without, it makes not much matter) but that he is prescribed unto by the spirit of another. But if it be a fault thus to restraine the spirit, I would faine know, is not the spirit restrained when the whole Congregation shall be confined to the form of this one mans composing? or it shall be unlawfull, or at least a disgrace and disparagement to use any set forms, especially of the Churches composition. More plainly thus.

Numb. 47. 2. Doth not the Minister confine and restraine the spirit of the Lords People, when they are tyed to his form? It would sound

ſound of more liberty to their ſpirits, that every one might make a prayer of his own and all pray together; and not be forced or confined to the Miniſters ſingle dictate, and private ſpirit. It is true, it would breed confuſions, and therefore they might pray ſilently till the Sermon began, and not for the avoiding one inconvenience runne into a greater, and to avoid the diſorder of a popular noyſe reſtraine the bleſſed Spirit; for even in this caſe as well as in the other, *Where the ſpirit of God is, there muſt be liberty.*

3. If the ſpirit muſt be at liberty, who ſhall aſſure us this liberty muſt be in forms of prayer? And if ſo, whether alſo it muſt be in publike prayer, and will it not ſuffice that it be in private? And if in publike prayers, is not the liberty of the ſpirit ſufficiently preſerved in that the publike ſpirit is free? That is, the Church hath power upon occaſion to alter and encreaſe her Litanyes. By what Argument ſhall any man make it ſo much as probable, that the holy Ghoſt is injured, if every private Miniſters private ſpirit ſhall be guided (and therefore by neceſſary conſequence limited) by the Authority of the Churches publick ſpirit? *Numb.* 48.

4. Does not the Directory that thing which is here called reſtraining of the ſpirit? Does it not appoint every thing but the words? And after this is it not a goodly *Palladium* that is contended for, and a princely liberty that they leave unto the Spirit, to be free only in the ſupplying the place of a Vocabulary and a *Copia Verborum?* For as for the matter, it is all there deſcribed and appointed, and to thoſe determined ſenſes the ſpirit muſt aſſiſt or not at all, only for the words he ſhall take his choyce. Now I deſire it may be conſidered ſadly and ſeriouſly: Is it not as much injury to the ſpirit to reſtraine his matter, as to appoint his words? Which is the more conſiderable of the two, ſenſe or Language, Matter or Words? I meane when they are taken ſingly and ſeparately. For ſo they may very well be (for as if men preſcribe the matter only, the ſpirit may cover it with ſeverall words and expreſſions, ſo if the ſpirit preſcribe the words, I may ſtill abound in variety of ſenſe, and preſerve the liberty of my meaning; we ſee that true in the various interpretations of the ſame words of Scripture.) So that in the *Numb.* 49.

greater

greater of the two, the Spirit is reſtrained, when his matter is appointed, and to make him amends, for not truſting him with the matter without our directions and limitations, we truſt him to ſay what he pleaſes, ſo it be to our ſenſe, to our purpoſes. A goodly compenſation ſurely!

Numb. 50. 5. Did not Chriſt reſtrain the ſpirit of his Apoſtles, when he taught them to pray the Lords Prayer, whether his precept to his Diſciples concerning it, was *Pray this*, or *Pray thus*, *Pray theſe words*, or *pray after this manner?* or though it had been leſſe then either, and been only a Directory for the matter, ſtill it is a thing which our Brethren in all other caſes of the ſame nature are reſolved perpetually to call a reſtraint. Certainly then this pretended reſtraint, is no ſuch formidable thing. Theſe men themſelves doe it by directing all the matter, and much of the manner, and Chriſt himſelfe did it, by preſcribing both the matter, and the words too.

Numb. 51. 6. Theſe reſtraints (as they are called) or determinations of the Spirit are made by the Spirit himſelfe. For I demand, when any Aſſembly of Divines appointed the matter of Prayers to all particular Miniſters as this hath done, is that appointment by the Spirit or no? If no, then for ought appears, this Directory not being made by Gods Spirit, may be an enemy to it. But if this appointment be by the Spirit, then the determination and limitation of the Spirit, is by the Spirit himſelf, and ſuch indeed is every pious and prudent conſtitution of the Church in matters ſpirituall: Such as was that of S. *Paul* to the *Corinthians*, when he preſcribed orders for publike prophecying, and interpretation, and ſpeaking with tongues. The ſpirit of ſome he ſo reſtrained, that he bound them to hold their peace, he permitted but two or three to ſpeak at one meeting, the reſt were to keep ſilence, though poſſibly ſix or ſeven might at that time have the Spirit.

Numb. 52. 7. Is it not a reſtraint of the Spirit to ſing a Pſalm in meeter by appointment? Cleerely as much as appointing formes of prayer or Euchariſt. And yet that we ſee done daily, and no ſcruple made. Is not this to be partiall in judgement, and inconſiderate of what wee doe?

Numb. 53. 8. And now after all this ſtrife, what harm is there in reſtraining the ſpirit in the preſent ſenſe? What prohibition, what law, what

what reaſon or revelation is againſt it? What inconvenience in the nature of the thing? For can any man be ſo weak as to imagine a deſpite is done to the ſpirit of grace, when thoſe gifts to his Church are uſed regularly and by order? As if prudence were no gift of Gods ſpirit, as if helps in Government, and the ordering ſpirituall matters were none of thoſe graces which Chriſt when he aſcended up on high gave unto Men. But this whole matter is wholly a ſtranger to reaſon, and never ſeen in Scripture.

For Divinity never knew any other vitious reſtraining of the Spirit, but either ſuppreſſing thoſe holy incitements to virtue and good life, which Gods Spirit miniſters to us externally or internally, or elſe a forbidding by publick Authority the Miniſters of the Word and Sacraments, to ſpeak ſuch truths as God hath commended, and ſo taking away the liberty of Prophecying. The firſt is directly vitious *In materia ſpeciale*, the ſecond is tyrannicall and Antichriſtian. And to it perſecution of true Religion is to be reduced. But as for this pretended limiting or reſtraining the ſpirit, *viz.* by appointing a regular form of prayer, it is ſo very a Chimera, that it hath no footing or foundation upon any ground where a wiſe man may build his confidence. *Numb.* 54.

9. But laſtly, how if the ſpirit muſt be reſtrained, and that by precept Apoſtolicall? That calls us to a new account. But if it be not true, what meanes S. *Paul*, by ſaying *The ſpirits of the Prophets muſt be ſubject to the Prophets?* What greater reſtraint then ſubjection? If ſubjected, then they muſt be ruled; if ruled, then limited, preſcribed unto, and as much under reſtraint as the ſpirits of the ſuperiour Prophets ſhall judge convenient. I ſuppoſe by this time this objection will trouble us no more. But perhaps another will. *Numb.* 55.

For why are not the Miniſters to be left as well to their liberty in making their Prayers as their Sermons? I anſwer, the Church may if ſhe will, but whether ſhe doth well or no, let her conſider. This I am ſure, there is not the ſame reaſon, and I fear the experience the world hath already had of it, will make demonſtration enough of the inconvenience. But however the differences are many. *Numb.* 56.

1. Our prayers offered up by the Miniſter, are in behalfe and *Numb.* 57.

in the name of the people, and therefore great reaſon they ſhould know before-hand, what is to be preſented, that if they like not the meſſage, they may refuſe to communicate; eſpecially ſince people are ſo divided in their opinions, in their hopes, and in their faiths: it being a duty to refuſe Communion with thoſe prayers which they think to have in them the matter of ſin or doubting. Which reaſon on the other part ceaſes, for the Miniſter being to ſpeak from God to the people, if he ſpeaks what he ought not, God can right himſelfe, however is not partner of the ſinne, as in the other caſe, the people poſſibly may be.

Numb. 58. 2. It is more fit a liberty be left in preaching then praying, becauſe the addreſſe of our diſcourſes and exhortations are to be made according to the underſtanding and capacity of the audience, their prejudices are to be removed, all advantages to be taken, and they are to be ſurprized that way they lie moſt open [*But being crafty I caught you*, ſaith Saint *Paul* to the *Corinthians*] and diſcourſes and arguments *ad hominem*, upon their particular principles and practices may more move them then the moſt polite and accurate that doe not comply and wind about their fancies and affections. S. *Paul* from the abſurd practice of being baptized for the dead, made an excellent Argument to convince the *Corinthians* of the Reſurrection. But this reaſon alſo ceaſes in our prayers. For God underſtandeth what we ſay ſure enough, he hath no prejudices to be removed, no infirmities to be wrought upon, and a fine figure of Rhetorick, a pleaſant cadence, and a curious expreſſion, move not him at all; no other twinings and complyances ſtirre him, but charity, and humility, and zeale, and importunity, which all are things internall and ſpirituall. And therefore of neceſſity there is to be great variety of diſcourſes to the people, and permiſſions accordingly, but not ſo to God, with whom a *Deus miſerere* prevailes as ſoon as the great office of 40 houres not long ſince invented in the Church of *Rome*, or any other prayers ſpun out to a length beyond the extenſion of the office of a Phariſee.

Numb. 59. 3. I feare it cannot ſtand with our reverence to God, to permit to every ſpirit a liberty of publike addreſſe to him in behalfe of the people. Indeed he that is not fit to pray, is not alwayes fit to preach; but it is more ſafe to be bold with the people then

with

with God, if the perſons be not ſo fit. In that there may be indiſcretion, but there may be impiety and irreligion in this The people may better excuſe and pardon an indiſcretion or a rudeneſſe (if any ſuch ſhould happen) then we may venture to offer it to God.

4. There is a latitude of Theology, much whereof is left to us, ſo, without preciſe and clear determination, that without breach either of faith or charity, men may differ in opinion: and if they may not be permitted to abound in their own ſenſe, they will be apt to complaine of tyrannie over conſciences, and that men Lord it over their faith. In Prayer this thing is ſo different, that it is imprudent and full of inconvenience to derive ſuch things into our prayers, which may with good profit be matter of Sermons. Therefore here a liberty may well enough be granted, when there it may better be denyed. *Numb.* 60.

5. But indeed, if I may freely declare my opinion, I think it were not amiſſe if the liberty of making Sermons were ſomething more reſtrained then it is, and that either ſuch perſons only were intruſted with liberty for whom the Church her ſelfe may ſafely bee reſponſall, that is, to men learned and pious, and that the other part, the *Vulgus Cleri*, ſhould inſtruct the people out of the fountaines of the Church, and upon the publick ſtock, till by ſo long exerciſe and diſcipline in the Schooles of the Prophets, they may alſo be intruſted to miniſter of their own unto the people. This I am ſure was the practice of the Primitive Church when Preaching was as ably and religiouſly performed as now it is. But in this I preſcribe nothing. But truly I think the reverend Divines of the Aſſembly are many of my mind in this particular, and that they obſerve a liberty indulged to ſome perſons to preach, which I think they had rather ſhould hold their peace, and yet think the Church better edified in your ſilence then their Sermons. *Numb.* 61.

6. But yet me thinks the Argument objected, if it were turned with the edge the other way, would have more reaſon in it: and inſtead of arguing [*Why ſhould not the ſame be allowed in praying as in preaching*] it were better to ſubſtitute this. If they can pray with the ſpirit, why alſo doe they not preach with the ſpirit? and if praying with the ſpirit be praying *ex* *Numb.* 62.

tempore, why ſhall they not preach *ex tempore* too, or elſe confeſſe that they preach without the ſpirit, or that they have not the gift of Preaching? For to ſay that the gift of prayer, is a gift *ex tempore*, but the gift of Preaching is with ſtudy and deliberation, is to become vaine and impertinent. *Quis enim diſcrevit?* Who hath made them of a different conſideration? I mean as to this particular, as to their efficient cauſe. Nor reaſon, nor revelation, nor God, nor man.

Numb. 63. To ſumme up all. If any man hath a mind to exerciſe his gift of Prayer, let him ſet himſelf to work, and compoſe Books of Devotion, (we have great need of them in the Church of *England*, ſo apparent need, that the Papiſts have made it an objection againſt us) and this his gift of Prayer will bee to edification. But otherwiſe, I underſtand it is more fit for oſtentation, then any ſpirituall advantage. For God hears us not the ſooner for our *ex tempore*, long, or corceived prayers; poſſibly they may become a hindrance, as in the caſes before inſtanced. And I am ſure if the people be intelligent, and can diſcern, they are hindred in their Devotion, for they dare not ſay *Amen* till they have conſidered; and many ſuch caſes will occurre in *ex tempore* prayers, that need much conſidering before we atteſt them. But if the people bee not intelligent, they are apt to ſwallow all the inconveniencies which may multiply in ſo great a licence; and therefore it were well that the Governours of the Church who are to anſwer for their ſoules, ſhould judge for them, before they ſay *Amen*, which judgement cannot bee without ſet-forms of Liturgy. My ſentence therefore is, ἵνα μένωμεν ὥσπερ ἔσμεν, Let us be as we are already. Few changes are for the better.

Numb. 64. For if it be pretended, that in the Liturgy of the Church of *England*, which was compoſed with much art and judgement by a Church that hath as much reaſon to be confident ſhe hath the Spirit and gifts of Prayer, as any ſingle perſon hath, and each learned man that was at its firſt compoſition, can as much prove that he had the Spirit, as the objectors now adayes: (and he that boaſts moſt, certainly hath the leaſt.) If I ſay it be prerended, there are many errours and inconveniences both in the order and the matter of the Common-Prayer Book, made by

ſuch

ſuch men, with ſo much induſtry: How much more, and with how much greater reaſon may we all dread the inconveniencies and diſorders of *ex tempore* prayers? where there is neither conjunction of heads, nor premeditation, nor induſtry, nor method, nor art, nor any of thoſe things (or at leaſt not in the ſame degree) which were likely to have exempted the Common-Prayer Book from errours and diſorders. If theſe things be in the green tree, what will be done in the dry?

But if it be ſaid, the *ex tempore* and conceived prayers will be ſecured from errour by the Directory, becauſe that chalks them out the matter. I anſwer, it is not ſufficient, becauſe if when men ſtudy both the matter and the words too, they may be (and it is pretended are actually) erroneous; much more may they when the matter is leſt much more at liberty, and the words under no reſtraint at all. And no man can avoid the preſſure and the weight of this, unleſſe the Compilers of the Directory were infallible, and that all their followers were ſo too, of the certainty of which I am not yet fully ſatisfied. *Numb.* 65.

And after all this I would fain know, what benefit and advantages ſhall the Church of *England* in her united capacity, and every particular in the diffuſed capacity receive by this new device? For the publike it is cleare, that whether the Miniſters pray before they ſtudy, or ſtudy before they pray, there muſt needs be infinite deformity in the publike worſhip, and all the benefits which were before the conſequents of conformity and unity, will be loſt, and if they be not valuable, I leave it to all them to conſider, who know the inconveniences of publike diſunion, and the publike diſunion that is certainly conſequent to them who doe not communicate in any common formes of worſhip. And to think that the Directory will bring conformity, is as if one ſhould ſay, that all who are under the ſame Hemiſphere are joyned *in communi patriâ*, and will love like Countrymen; for under the Directory there will be as different Religions, and as different deſires, and as differing formes as there are ſeverall varieties of men and manners under the one halfe of heaven, who yet breath under the ſame halfe of the Globe. But I ask again, what benefit can the publike receive by this forme, or this no forme, for I know not whether to call it. Shall the *Numb.* 66.

matter of prayers be better in all Churches? ſhall God be better ſerved? ſhall the word of God and the beſt patterns of prayers be alwayes exactly followed? It is well if it be. But there is ſecurity given us by the Directory; for the matter is left at every mans diſpoſe for all that, and we muſt depend upon the honeſty of every particular for it; and if any man proves a Heretick, or a Knave, then he may introduce what impiety he pleaſe, into the publick formes of Gods worſhip; and there is no law made to prevent it, and it muſt be cured afterwards if it can; but before-hand it is not prevented at all by the Directory, which truſts every man. But I obſerve, that all the benefit which is pretended, is, that it will make an able Miniſtery, which I confeſſe I am very much from believing, and ſo will every man be that conſiders what kind of men they are that have been moſt zealous for that way of conceived prayer. I am ſure that very few of the learneſt, very many ignorants, moſt thoſe who have made leaſt abode in the Schools of the Prophets. And that I may diſgrace no mans perſon, we ſee Tradeſmen of the moſt illiberall arts, and women pretend to it, and doe it with as many words (and that's the maine thing) with as much confidence, and ſpecious neſſe, and ſpirit, as the beſt among them. And it is but a ſmall portion of learning that will ſerve a man to make conceived formes of prayer, which they have eaſily upon the ſtock of other men, or upon their own fancie, or upon any thing in which no learning is required. He that knowes nothing of the craft may be in the Preachers trade. But what? Is God better ſerved? I would faine ſee any Authority, or any reaſon, or any probability for that. I am ſure ignorant men offer him none of the beſt ſacrifices *ex tempore*, and learned men will be ſure to deliberate, and know. God is then better ſerved when he ſerved by a publike, then when by a private [illegible] I cannot imagine what accruements will hence come to the publike: it may be ſome advantages may be to the private intereſts of men. For there are a ſort of men whom our bleſſed Saviour noted who do *devoure widowes houſes, and for a pre-*[illegible]*yers*. They make prayers, and they make [illegible] meanes they receive double advantages, for [illegible] to their ability, and to their piety. And although

although the Common-prayer Book in the Preface to the Directory bee charged with unneceſſary length, yet we ſee that moſt of theſe men, they that are moſt eminent or would be ſo, make their prayers longer, and will not loſe the benefits which their credit gets, and they by their credit, for making their prayers.

Adde to this that there is no promiſe in Scripture, that he who prayes *ex tempore* ſhall be heard the better, or that he ſhall bee aſſiſted at all to ſuch purpoſes; and therefore to innovate in ſo high a matter without a warrant to command us, or a promiſe to warrant us, is no better then vanity in the thing, and preſumption in the perſon. He therefore that conſiders that this way of prayer is without all manner of precedent in the Primitive Church, againſt the example of all famous Churches in all Chriſtendome in the whole deſcent of 15. Ages, without all command and warrant of Scripture, that it is unreaſonable in the nature of the thing, againſt prudence and the beſt wiſedome of humanity, becauſe it is without deliberation, that it is innovation in a high degree without that Authority which is truly and by inherent and ancient right to command and preſcribe to us in externall forms of worſhip, that it is much to the diſgrace of the firſt reformers of our Religion, that it gives encouragement to the Papiſts, to quarrell with ſome reaſon and more pretence againſt our Reformation, as being by the Directory confeſſed to have been done in much blindneſſe, and therefore might erre in the exceſſe as well as in the defect, in the throwing out too much, as caſting off too little, which is the more likely, becauſe they wanted zeale to carry it farre enough. He that conſiders the univerſall deformity of publike worſhip and the no meanes of union, no Symbol of publike communion being publikely conſigned, that all Hereſies may with the ſame Authority bee brought into our prayers, and offered to God in behalfe of the people, with the ſame Authority that any truth may. all the matter of our prayers being left to the choyce of all men, of all perſwaſions, and then obſerves that actually there are in many places, hereſie, and blaſphemy, and impertinency, and illiterate rudeneſſes put into the devotions of the moſt Solemne dayes, and the moſt publike meetings;

meetings; and then laſtly, that there are divers parts of Lyturgy, for which no proviſions at all is made in the Directory, and the very adminiſtration of the Sacraments left ſo looſely, that if there be any thing eſſentiall in the forms of Sacraments, the Sacrament may come ineffectuall by want of due words, and due miniſtration. I ſay, he that conſiders all theſe things (and many more he may conſider) will finde that particular men are not fit to be intruſted to offer in publike with their private ſpirit, to God, for the people, in ſuch ſolemnities, in matters of ſo great concernment, where the honour of God, the benefit of the people, the intereſt of Kingdomes, the being of a Church, the unity of minds, the conformity of practice, the truth of perſwaſions, and the ſalvation of ſoules, are ſo very much concerned, as they are in the publike prayers of a whole Nationall Church. An unlearned man is not to be truſted, and a wiſe man dare not truſt himſelfe; hee that is ignorant cannot, he that is knowing will not.

The End.

OF

THE SACRED ORDER AND OFFICES OF EPISCOPACIE,

By *Divine Institution, Apostolicall Tradition,* and *Catholique Practice.*

TOGETHER WITH

Their Titles of Honour, Secular Employment, Manner of Election, Delegation of their Power, and other appendant questions, asserted against the *Aerians*, and *Acephali*, new and old.

BIBL. CANT. ACAD.

By IER: TAYLOR, *D. D.* Chaplaine in Ordinarie to His MAJESTIE

Published by His MAJESTIES Command.

ROM. 13. 1.

There is no power but of God. The Powers that be, are ordained of God.

CONCIL. CHALCED.

Δικαία ἡ κρίσις τῶν Πατέρων. Πάντες τὰ αὐτὰ λέγομεν.

LONDON,

Printed for RICHARD ROYSTON, at the Angel in Ivie-lane. 1647.

~~877.69~~
'74-2706

TO THE
TRVLY VVORTHY
AND MOST ACCOMPLISHT
Sr CHRISTOPHER HATTON
Knight of the Honourable Order of the BATH.

SIR,

I AM ingag'd in the defence of a Great Truth, and J would willingly finde a ſhrowd to cover my ſelfe from danger, and calumny; and although the cauſe both is & ought to be defended by Kings, yet my perſon muſt

not goe thither to Sanctuary, unleſſe it be to pay my devotion, and I have now no other left for my defence, I am robd of that which once did bleſſe me, and indeed ſtill does, (but in another manner) and I hope will doe more; but thoſe diſtillations of cœleſtiall dewes are conveyed in Channels not pervious to an eye of ſenſe, and now adayes we ſeldome look with other, be the object never ſo beauteous or alluring. You may then think, *Sir*, I am forc'd upon You; may that beg my pardon and excuſe, but I ſhould do an injury to Your Nobleneſſe, if I ſhould onely make You a refuge for my need, (pardon this truth) you are allo of the faireſt choice, not only for Your love of Learning, (for although that be eminent in You, yet it is not Your eminence) but for Your duty to H. Church, for Your loyaltie to His ſacred *Majeſtie*. Theſe did prompt me with the greateſt confidence to hope for Your faire incouragement, and aſſiſtance in my pleadings for *Epiſcopacy*, in which cauſe Religion, and *Majeſty*, the *King*, and the *Church* are intereſted as parties of mutuall concernment

There was an odde obſervation made long agoe

agoe, and regiſtred in the Law to make it authentick, *Laici ſunt infenſi Clericis.* Now the Clergy pray, but fight not, and therefore if not ſpecially protected by the King *contra Eccleſiam Malignantium*, they are made obnoxious to all the contumelies, and injuries, which an envious multitude will inflict upon them. It was obſerv'd enough in King *Edgars* time, *Quamvis decreta Pontificum, & verba Sacerdotum in convulſis ligaminibus velut fundamenta montium fixa ſunt, tamen plerumq; tempeſtatibus, & turbinibus ſæcularium rerum Religio S. Matris Eccleſiæ maculis reproborum diſſipatur, ac rumpitur. Idcirco Decrevimus Nos &c.* There was a ſad example of it in K. *Iohn's* time. For when he threw the Clergy from his Protection, it is incredible what injuries, what affronts, what robberies, yea what murders were committed upon the Biſhops, and Prieſts of H. Church, whom neither the Sacredneſſe of their perſons, nor the Lawes of God, nor the terrors of Conſcience, nor feares of Hell, nor Church-cenſures, nor the Lawes of Hoſpitality could protect from Scorne, from blowes, from ſlaughter. Now there being ſo

In charta Edgar. *Regis.* A. D. 485. *apud* Hen. Spelman.

neer a tye as the neceſſity of their own preſervation in the midſt of ſo apparent danger, it will tye the *Biſhops* hearts, and hands to the King faſter then all the tyes of Lay-Allegiance, (all the Politicall tyes I mean,) all that are not preciſely religious, and obligations in the Court of Conſcience.

2. But the intereſt of the *Biſhops* is conjunct with the proſperity of the *King*, beſides the intereſt of their own ſecuritie; by the obligation of ſecular advantages. For they who have their livelyhood from the *King*, and are in expectance of their fortune from him are more likely to pay a tribute of exacter duty, then others, whoſe fortunes are not in ſuch immediate dependancy on His Majeſty. *Æneas Sylvius* once gave a merry reaſon why Clerks advanced the Pope above a Councell, *viz.* becauſe the Pope gave ſpirituall promotions, but the Councels gave none. It is but the Common expectation of gratitude, that a Patron Paramount ſhall be more aſsiſted by his Beneficiaries in caſes of neceſsity, then by thoſe, who receive nothing from him but the common influences of Goverment.

3. But

3. But the *Bishops* duty to the *King* derives it selfe from a higher fountaine. For it is one of the maine excellencies in Christianity, that it advances the State, and well being of Monarchies, and Bodies Politique. Now then the Fathers of Religion the Reverend *Bishops*, whose peculiar office it is to promote the interests of Christianity, are by the nature and essentiall requisites of their office bound to promote the Honour and Dignity of *Kings*, whom Christianity would have so much honour'd, as to establish the just subordination of people to their Prince, upon better principles then ever, no lesse then their precise duty to God, and the hopes of a blissefull immortality. Here then is *utile, honestum*, and *necessarium*, to tye *Bishops* in duty to *Kings*; and a threefold Cord is not easily broken.

In pursuance of these obligations *Episcopacy* payes three returnes of tribute to Monarchy.

1. The first is the Duty of their people. For they being by God himselfe set over soules, judges of the most secret recesses of our Consciences, and the venerable Priests under them, have

have more power to keep men in their duteous ſubordination to the Prince, then there is in any ſecular power, by how much more forcible the impreſſions of the Conſcience are, then all the externall violence in the world. And this power they have fairely put into act, for there was never any Proteſtant *Biſhop* yet in Rebellion, unleſſe he turn'd recreant to his Order, and it is the honour of the Church of *England*, that all her Children, and obedient people are full of indignation againſt Rebells, be they of any intereſt, or party whatſoever. For here (& for it we thanke God and good Princes) *Epiſcopacy* hath been preſerv'd in faire priviledges and honour, and God hath bleſt and honour'd *Epiſcopacy* with the conjunction of a loyall people. As if becauſe in the law of Nature the Kingdome and Prieſthood were joyned in one perſon, it were naturall, and conſonant to the firſt juſtice, that Kings ſhould defend the rights of the Church, and the Church advance the honour of *Kings*. And when I conſider that the firſt *Biſhop* that was exauctorated was a Prince too, Prince, and *Biſhop* of *Geneva*, me thinks it was an ill *Omen*, that the

cauſe

cauſe of the *Prince*, and the *Biſhop* ſhould be in Conjunction ever after.

2. A ſecond returne that *Epiſcopacy* makes to *Royalty* is that which is the Duty of all Chriſtians, the paying tributes, and impoſitions. And though all the *Kings* Leige people doe it, yet the iſſues of their duty, and liberality are mightily diſproportionate if we conſider their unequall Number, and Revenues. And if Clergy-ſubſidies be eſtimated according to the ſmallneſſe of their revenue, and paucity of perſons, it will not be half ſo ſhort of the number, and weight of Crownes from Lay Diſpenſation, as it does farre exceed in the proportion of the Donative.

3. But the aſſiſtance that the Kings of England had in their Counſells, and affaires of greateſt difficulty, from the great ability of *Biſhops*, and other the Miniſters of the Church, I deſire to repreſent in the words of K. *Alvred* to *Walfſigeus* the *Biſhop*, in an Epiſtle where he deplores the miſery of his owne age by comparing it with the former times, when the *Biſhops* were learn'd, and exercil'd in publike Counſels. *Felicia tum tempora fuerunt inter omnes Angla*

populos; Reges Deo, & ſcriptæ ejus voluntati obſecundârunt in ſuâ pace, & bellicis expeditionibus, atq; regimine domeſtico domi ſe ſemper tutatos fuerint, atq; etiam foris nobilitatem ſuam dilataverint. The reaſon was, as he inſinuates before, *Sapientes extiterunt in Anglicâ gente de ſpirituali gradu &c.* The *Biſhops* were able by their great learning, and wiſdome to give aſſiſtance to the *Kings* affaires. And they have proſper'd in it, for the moſt glorious iſſues of Divine Beniſon upon this Kingdome were conveyed to us by *Biſhops* hands, I meane the Union of the houſes of *York* & *Lancaſter*, by the Counſells of [a] *Biſhop Morton*, and of *England* & *Scotland* by the treaty of [b] *Biſhop Fox*, to which if we adde two other *in Materia religionis*, I meane the converſion of the Kingdom from *Paganiſme*, by S[t] *Auguſtine Archbiſhop of Canterbury*; and the reformation, begun and promoted by *Biſhops*, I think we cannot call to mind foure bleſsings equall to theſe in any age or Kingdome, in all which God was pleaſed by the mediation of *Biſhops*, as he uſeth to doe, to bleſſe the people. And this may not only be expected in reaſon, but in good Divinity, for amongſt

a Iohn Speeds *Hiſt. l.9. c.19.n. 23.p.716.*
b *Ibid. c.20. n.64.p.747.*

mongſt the gifts of the ſpirit, which God hath given to his Church, are reckon'd *Doctors Teachers, and* * *helps in government.* To which may be added this advantage, that the ſervices of Church-men are rewardable upon the Churches ſtock; no need to diſimprove the Royall Banks to pay thanks to *Biſhops.*

* 1 Cor. 12. v. 28.

But, Sir, I grow troubleſome. Let this diſcourſe have what ends it can; the uſe J make of it, is but to pretend reaſon for my Boldneſſe, and to entitle You to my Book: for I am confident you will owne any thing that is but a friends friend to a cauſe of Loyalty. I have nothing elſe to plead for your acceptance, but the confidence of your Goodneſſe, and that I am a perſon capeable of your pardon, and of a faire interpretation of my addreſſe to you, by being

SIR

Your moſt affectionate Servant

J. TAYLOR.

Syllabus Paragraphorum.

§. 1. *Christ did institute a government in his Church.* p. 7

2. *This government was first committed to the Apostles by Christ,* p. 12

3. *With a power of joyning others and appointing Successours in the Apostolate,* p. 13

4. *This succession into the ordinary office of Apostolate is made by Bishops,* p. 15.
For the Apostle and the Bishop are all one in name and person,

5. *And office,* p. 20.

6. *Which Christ himselfe hath made distinct from Presbyters,* p. 22

7. *Giving to Apostles a power to doe some offices perpetually necessary, which to others he gave not,* p. 23
As of Ordination,

8. *And Confirmation,* p. 28

9. *And superiority of Iurisdiction.* p. 35

10. *So that Bishops are successors in the office of Apostleship, according to the generall tenent of antiquitie,* p. 49

11 *And particularly of S.* Peter, p. 54

12 *And the institution of Episcopacy as well as of the Apostolate expressed to be* Divine *by primitive authority.* p.62

13 *In pursuance of the* Divine institution, *the Apostles did ordain Bishops in severall Churches,* p.68
As St Iames *at* Ierusalem,
S. Simeon *to be his successor,*

14 S Timothy *at* Ephesus, p 75

15 S. Titus *at* Creet, p.85

16 S. Mark *at* Alexandria, p.93

17 S. Linus *and* S. Clement *at* Rome, p.96

18 S. Polycarp *at* Smyrna, *and divers others.* p.97

19 *So that Episcopacy is at least an Apostolical Ordinance, of the same authority with many other points generally believed,* p.100

20 *And was an office of power and great authority,* p.102

21 *Not lessened by the assistance and Councell of Presbyters,* p.104

22 *And all this hath been the faith and practice of Christendome,* p.125

23 *Who first distinguished names used before in common,* p.128

24 *Appropriating the word* Episcopus *or Bishop to the supream Church Officer,* p.139

25 *Calling the* Bishop *and him onely the Pastor of the Church,* p.145

26 *And Doctor,* p.149

27 *And Pontifex, And Sacerdos.* p.150

28 *And these were a distinct order from the rest,* p.156

29 *To which the Presbyterate was but a degree,* p.160

30 *There being a peculiar manner of Ordination to a Bishoprick,*

ſhoprick, p. 161

31 To which Presbyters never did aſsist by impoſing hands. p.164

32 Biſhops had a power diſtinct, and ſuperiour to that of Presbyters, p.175

33 Power of Confirmation, p.198

34 Power of Iuriſdiction, p.209

Which they expreſsed in attributes of authority and great power.

35 Vniverſall obedience given to Biſhops by Clergy and Laity. p.214

36 Biſhops were appointed Iudges of the Clergy, and ſpirituall cauſes of the Laity. p.220

37 Presbyters forbidden to officiate without Epiſcopall licenſe. p.251

38 Church-goods reſerved to Epiſcopal diſpenſatiõ. 264

39 Presbyters forbidden to leave their own Dioces, or to travell without leave of the Biſhop. p.266

40 The Biſhop had power to prefer which of his Clerks he pleaſed. p.267

41 Biſhops onely did vote in Councels, and neither Presbyters, nor People. p.282

42 The Biſhop had a propriety in the perſons of his Clerks. p.292

43 The Biſhops Iuriſdiction was over many Congregations, or Pariſhes. p.295

44 Their Iuriſdiction was ayded by Presbyters, but not impayred. p.311

45 The government of the Church by Biſhops was believed neceſſary. p.323

46 They are Schiſmaticks that ſeparate from their Biſhop,

ſhop, p.327
47 *And Hereticks.* p.329
48 *Biſhops were alwaies in the Church men of great honour*, p.335
49 *And truſted with affaires of Secular intereſt*, p.351
50 *And therefore were inforced to delegate their power and put others in ſubſtitution*, p.371
51 *But they were ever Clergy-men, for there never was any lay-Elders in any Church-office heard of in the Church.* p.375

ERRATA.

PAg.21, line 8. *inſert*, except S John. Pag.141.l.15. Presbyters, *read* Biſhops. Pag.243. *line* 14. after Epiſcopacy, *inſert* &c. & l.15. *after* Biſhops *inſert* Clerk. Pag.354.l.11. *read* were Farmers.

OF THE

Sacred Order, and Offices of

EPISCOPACY

BY DIVINE INSTITUTION,

APOSTOLICALL TRADITION,

& Catholick practiſe &c.

IN all thoſe accurſed machinations, which the device, and artifice of Hell hath invented, for the ſupplanting of the Church, *Inimicus homo*, that *old ſuperſeminator of hereſies*, and crude miſchiefes, hath indeavoured, to be curiouſly compendious, and with *Tarquin's* device, *putare ſumma papaverum*. And therefore in the three ages of *Martyrs*, it was a rul'd

A caſe

case in that *Burgundian forge*, *Qui prior erat dignitate prior trahebatur ad Martyrium.* The *Priests*, but to be sure the *Bishops* must pay for all. *Tolle impios, Polycarpus requiratur.* Away with these pedling persecutions, ἀξίνην πρὸς τὴν ῥίζαν. Lay the axe at the *root* of the tree. Insomuch that in *Rome* from S. *Peter*, and *S. Paul* to S. *Sylvester*, thirty three Bishops of Rome, in immediate succession, suffered an Honourable, and glorious Martyrdome, unlesse * *Meltiades* be perhaps excepted, whom *Eusebius*, and *Optatus* report to have lived till the time of the third Consulship of *Constantine* and *Licinius*. *Conteret caput ejus*, was the glorious promise, Christ should *break the Divell's head*, and though the Divell's active part of the Duell was farre lesse, yet he would venture at that too, even to strike at the *heads of the Church*, *capita vicaria*, for *the head of all* was past his striking now; And this, I say, he offered to doe by *Martyrdome*, but that insteed of *breaking*, *crown'd them*.

* *Maximini jussu Martyrio coronatur.* Saith *Platina*, but that is wholly uncertaine.

His next onset was by *Iulian*, and *occidere Presbyterium*, that was his Province. To shut up publick Schooles, to force Christians to ignorance, to impoverish, and disgrace the *Clergy*, to make them vile, and dishonourable, these were his arts; and he did the Divell more service in this fineness of undermining, then all the open battery of the ten great Rammes of persecution. But this would not take. For, *that which is without cannot defile a man.* So it is in the *Church* too. *Cedunt in bonum, all violences ab extrà.*

But

But therefore besides these he attempted by *heresies* to rent the Churches bowels all in pieces; but the good *Bishops* gathered up the scattered pieces & reunited them at *Nice*, at *Constantinople*, at *Ephesus*, at *Chalcedon*, at *Carthage*, at *Rome*, and in every famous place of Christendome, and by God's goodnesse, and the *Bishops* industry Catholick religion was conserved in Vnity, and integrity. Well! however it is, *Antichrist* must come at last, and the great *Apostacy* foretold must be, and this, not without means proportionable to the production of so great declensions of Christianity. *When ye heare of warres, and rumors of warres, be not afraid* (said our B. Saviour,) *the end is not yet*. It is not *warre* that will doe *this great work of destruction*, for then it might have been done long 'ere now. What then will doe it? We shall know when we see it. In the meane time when we shall find *a new device*, of which indeed the platforme was laid, in *Aërius*, and the *Acephali*, brought to a good possibility of compleating, a thing that *whosoever shall heare, his ears shall tingle, an abhomination of desolation standing where it ought not, in sacris*, in *holy persons*, and *places*, and *offices*, it is too probable that this is the *præparatory* for *the Antichrist*, and *grand Apostacy*.

For if *Antichrist* shall exalt himselfe above all that is *called God*, and in Scripture none but *Kings*, and *Priests* are *such*, *Dii vocati*, *Dii facti*, I think we have great reason to be suspitious, that he that devests *both* of their power (and they are, if the

King be Christian, in very neer conjunction,) does the work of *Antichrist* for him; especially if the men, whom it most concernes, will but call to mind, that the discipline, or Government, which Christ hath instituted, is that Kingdome, by which he governes all Christendome (so themselves have taught us) so that, in case it be proved, that *Episcopacy* is *that government*, then they (to use their own expressions) throw *Christ* out of *his Kingdome*; and then, either they leave the Church without a *head*, or else put *Antichrist* in substitution.

We all wish, that our feares in this, and all things else, may be vaine, that what we feare, may not come upon us; but yet that the *abolition of Episcopacy* is *the fore-runner*, and *præparatory to the great Apostacy*, I have these reasons to shew, at least the probability. 1. *First*, Because here is a concurse of times; for now after that these times have been called the *last* times, for 1600 years together, our expectation of the *Great revelation* is very neer accomplishing; & what a *Grand innovation* of *Ecclesiasticall government*, contrary to the *faith*, & *practice of Christendome*, may portend now in these times, when we all expect *Antichrist* to be revealed is worthy of a jealous mans inquiry. 2. *Secondly*, Episcopacy, if we consider the finall cause, was instituted as an *obstructive to the diffusion of Schisme and Heresy*. So * S. *Hierome*. *In toto orbe decretum est, ut unus de Presbyteris electus superponeretur cæteris,* VT SCHISMATVM SEMINA TOLLERENTVR. And therefore if *Vnity* and *division* be destructive of each

* in 1. ad Tit. ii

each other, then *Episcopacy* is the best *deletery* in the world for *Schisme*: and so much the rather because they are *in eâdem materiâ*; for *Schisme* is a division for things either personall, or accidentall, which are matters, most properly the subject of government, and there to be tryed, there to receive their first, and last breath, except where they are starv'd to death by a *desuetude*; and *Episcopacy* is an Unity of person governing, and ordering persons, and things, accidentall, and substantiall; and therefore a direct confronting of *Schisme*, not only in the *intention* of the author of it, but in the *nature of the institution*. Now then, although *Schismes* alwaies will be, and this by divine prediction (which clearly showes the *necessity* of perpetuall Episcopacy, and the *intention* of its perpetuity, either by *Christ* himselfe ordaining it, who made the prophecy, or by the *Apostles* and *Apostolick men* at least, who knew the prophecy:) yet to be sure, these divisions, and dangers shall be greater about, and at the time of the *Great Apostacy*; for then, were not the houres turned into minutes, an universall ruine should seize all Christendome [*No flesh should be saved if those daies were not shortned.*] is it not next to an evidence of fact, that this multiplication of *Schismes* must be *removendo prohibens?* and therefore that must be by *invalidating Episcopacy*, ordayn'd as the *remedy* and *obex of Schisme*, either tying their hands behind them, by taking away their *coërcion*, or by putting out their eyes, by denying them *cognisance of causes spirituall*, or by *cutting off their heads*, and so de-

ſtroying their *order*. How farre theſe will lead us, I leave to be conſidered. This only; *Percute paſtores, atq; oves deſpergentur*; and I believe it will be verified at the comming of that wicked one, *I ſaw all Iſrael ſcattered upon the Mountaines as ſheep having no ſheapheard.*

I am not new in this conception, I learn't it of
Epiſt. 55. S. *Cyprian*; *Chriſti adverſarius, & Eccleſiæ ejus inimicus ad hoc,* Ecclesiæ Præpositvm *ſuâ infeſtatione perſequitur, ut, Gubernatore ſublato, atrociùs, atq; violentiùs circà Eccleſiæ naufragia graſſetur.* The adverſary of *Chriſt* and enemy of his *Spouſe* therefore perſecutes the *Biſhop*, that having taken *him* away, he may without check pride himſelfe in the ruines of the *Church*; and a little after ſpeaking of them, that are enemies to Biſhops, he ſayes, that, *Antichriſti jam propinquantis adventum imitantur*, their deportment is juſt after the guiſe of *Antichriſt* who is ſhortly to be revealed.

But be this conjecture vaine, or not, the thing, of it ſelfe is of deep conſideration, and the *Catholick practiſe of Chriſtendome for* 1500 *years* is ſo inſupportable a prejudice againſt the enemies of Epiſcopacy, that they muſt bring admirable evidence of Scripture, or a cleare *revelation proved by Miracles*, or a contrary *undoubted tradition Apoſtolicall* for themſelves, or elſe hope for no beliefe againſt the preſcribed poſſeſſion of ſo many ages.

But before I begin, mee thinks in this conteſtation, *ubi potior eſt conditio poſſidentis*, it is a conſiderable Queſtion; what will the Adverſaries ſtake a-

gainſt

gainst it? For if *Episcopacy* cannot make its title good, they loose the benefit of their prescribed possession. If it can; I feare they will scarce gain so much, as the *obedience* of the adverse party by it, which yet already is their due. It is very unequall; but so it is ever, when *Authority* is the matter of the Question. Authority never gaines by it; for although the cause goe on its side, yet it looses *costs*, and *dammages*; for it must either by faire condescention to gain the adversaries', loose something of it selfe, or, if it asserts it selfe to the utmost, it is but where it was; but that seldome or never happens, for the very questioning of any authority, *hoc ipso*, makes a great intrenchment even to the very skirts of its cloathing.

But *hûc deventum est*. Now we are in, we must goe over.

§. 1. Christ did institute a government in his Church.

FIrst then, that wee may build upon a Rock. *Christ* did institute a *government* to order and rule his Church by his authority, according to his lawes, and by the assistance of the B. Spirit.

1. If this were not true, how shall the Church be governed? For I hope the adversaries of Episcopacy, that are so punctuall to pitch all upon Scripture ground, will be sure to produce cleare Scripture for so maine a part of Christianity, as is the forme of the Government of Christs Church. And, if for our private actions; and duties *Oeconomicall*, they will pretend a text, I suppose, it will not be thought possible, Scripture should make default in

in aſſignation of the *publick Government*, inſo-much as all lawes intend the publick, and the gene-rall directly; the private, and the particular, by con-ſequence only, and comprehenſion within the ge-nerall.

2. If Chriſt himſelfe did not take order for a government, then we muſt derive it from *humane prudence*, and emergency of conveniences, and con-curſe of new circumſtances, and then the Govern-ment muſt often be *changed*, or elſe time muſt ſtand ſtill, and things be ever in the ſame ſtate and poſſibi-lity. Both the conſequents are extreamely full of in-convenience. For if it be left to *humane prudence*, then either the government of the Church is not in immediate order to the good, and beniſon of ſoules, or if it be, that ſuch an inſtitution, in ſuch immedi-ate order to eternity, ſhould be dependant upon *hu-mane prudence*, it were to truſt ſuch a rich comm o-dity in a cock-boat, that no wiſe Pilot will be ſup-poſed to doe. But if there be often *changes* in go-vernment Eccleſiaſticall (which was the other conſequent) in the publike frame I meane, and con-ſtitution of it; either the certain infinity of Schiſmes will ariſe, or the dangerous iſſues of publick incon-ſiſtence, and innovation, which, in matters of reli-gion, is good for nothing, but to make men di-ſtruſt all; and, come the beſt that can come, there will be ſo many *Church governments*, as there are *humane Prudences*. For ſo (if I be not mis-infor-med) it is abroad in ſome townes that have *diſ-charged Epiſcopacy*. At St *Galles* in *Switzerland* there

Simler: de rep: Helvet: fol. 148. & 172.

there the *Ministers*, and *Lay-men* rule in *Common*, but a *Lay-man* is *president*. But the Consistories of *Zurick* and *Basil* are wholly consistent of *Lay-men*, and *Ministers* are joyned as *assistants* only, and *Counsellors*, but at *Schaffhausen* the *Ministers* are not admitted to so much, but in the *Huguenot Churches of France, the Ministers doe all.*

3. In such cases, where there is no power of the sword for a compulsory (and confessedly of all sides there can be none in causes & Courts Ecclesiasticall) if there be no opinion of Religion, no derivation from a divine authority, there will be sure to be no obedience, and indeed nothing but a certain, publick, calamitous irregularity. For why should they obay? Not for *Conscience*, for there is no derivation from divine authority. Not for *feare*, for they have not the *power of the sword.*

4. If there be such a thing as the power of the keyes, by Christ concredited to his Church, for the binding and loosing delinquents, and penitents respectively on earth, then there is clearely a Court erected by Christ in his Church, for here is the delegation of Iudges, *Tu Petrus, vos Apostoli*, whatsoever *ye shall* bind. Here is a compulsory, *ligaveritis*; Here are the causes of which they take cognisance, *Quodcunq;*; viz. *in materiâ scandali.* For so it is limited *Matth.*18. but it is indefinite *Matth.*16. and Vniversall, *Iohn.*20. which yet is to be understood *secundùm materiam subjectam*, in causes, which are emergent from Christianity, *ut sic*, that secular jurisdictions may not be intrenched upon. But of this

hereafter. That Christ did in this place erect a *Iurisdiction*, and establish a *government* (besides the evidence of fact) is generally asserted by primitive exposition of the Fathers, affirming, that to S. *Peter* the *Keyes* were given, that to the *Church* of all ages a power of *binding* and *loosing* might be communicated. *Has igitur claves dedit Ecclesiæ, ut quæ solveret in terrâ, soluta essent in cœlo; scil. ut quisquis in Ecclesiâ ejus dimitti sibi peccata crederet, seq; ab iis correctus averteret in ejusdem Ecclesiæ gremio constitutus eâdem fide atq; correctione sanaretur.* So * S. *Austin.* And againe, *Omnibus igitur sanctis ad Christi corpus inseparabiliter pertinentibus propter hujus vitæ procellosissima gubernaculum ad liganda & solvenda peccata claves regni cœlorum primus Apostolorum Petrus accepit; Quoniam nec ille solus, sed universa Ecclesia ligat, solvitq; peccata.* S. *Peter* first received the *government* in the power of *binding* and *loosing*. But not he alone but *all the Church*, to wit, all succession, and ages of the Church. *Universa Ecclesia, viz. in Pastoribus solis*, as * S. *Chrysostom*, *In Episcopis & Presbyteris* as † S. *Ierome*. The *whole Church*, as it is represented in the *Bishops* and *Presbyters*. The same is affirmed by [a] *Tertullian*, [b] S. *Cyprian*, [c] S. *Chrysostome*, [d] S. *Hilary*, [e] *Primasius*, and generally by the Fathers of the elder, and Divines of the middle ages.

5. When our blessed Saviour had spoken a parable of the sudden coming of the sonne of Man, & commanded them therefore with diligence to stand upon their watch, the Disciples asked him, *speakest thou*

* *De doctr. Christ. lib.* 1. *c.* 18. *tract.* 118. *in Iohan. vide etiam tract.* 124. *& tract.* 50. *in Ioh. de Agon. Christ. cap.* 30 *de bapt. contr. Donatist. lib.* 3. *c.* 17.

* *De Sacerd. lib.* 3.

† *In* 16. *Matt.*

[a] *Lib. de pudicit.*

[b] *Epist.* 27.

[c] *Lib. qd Christus est Deus.*

[d] *Lib* 6. *de Trinit.*

[e] *Lib.* 3. *in Apocal.*

Luke, 12. 42.

thou this parable to us, or even to all? And the Lord ſaid, who then is that faithfull and wiſe ſteward, whom his Lord ſhall make ruler over his houſhold to give them their portion of meat in due ſeaſon? As if he had ſaid, I ſpeak to *You*, for to whom elſe ſhould I ſpeak and give caution for the looking to the houſe in the Maſters abſence? *You* are by office and deſignation *my Stewards*, to feed my ſervants, to governe my houſe.

6. In Scripture, and other writers, to *Feed*, and to *Governe*, is all one when the office is either Politicall or Oeconomicall, or Eccleſiaſticall. *So he* FED *them with a faithfull and true heart, and* RULED *them prudently with all his power.* And S. *Peter* joynes, ἐπισκοποῦντες and ποιμαίνοντες together. ποιμάνατε τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν ποίμνιον τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐπισκοποῦντες. So does S. *Paul*, προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς καὶ παντὶ τῷ ποιμνίῳ ἐν ᾧ ὑμᾶς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἔθετο Ἐπισκόπους. Ἐπισκόπους ἐν ποιμνίῳ. Rulers or overſeers in a flock. Paſtors. It is ordinary. ποιμένα λαῶν. *Homer.* ι, ε, βασιλέα ὄχλων. *Euripides* calls the Governors and guides of Chariots, ποιμένας ὄχων. And our bleſſed Saviour himſelfe is called the *Great ſheapheard of our ſoules*; and that we may know the *intentum* of that compellation, it is in conjunction alſo with Ἐπίσκοπος. He is therefore our ſheapheard, for he is our *Biſhop*, our *Ruler*, and *Overſeer*. Since then Chriſt hath left *Paſtors* or *Feeders* in his Church, it is alſo as certain he hath left *Rulers*, they being both one in *name*, in *perſon*, in *office*. But this is of a known truth to all that underſtand either lawes or langua-

Pſal. 78.

1. Pet. 5. 2.

Act. 20.

ges: ὅτι ὁ ποιμαίνοντες ἀρχόντων καὶ ἡγεμόνων ἔχοντες δυνάμιν

* *in lib: de eo quod deterior potiori insidiatur.*

saith * *Philo*, they that *feed* have the power of *Princes* and *rulers*; the thing is an undoubted truth to most men, but because all are not of a mind something was necessary for confirmation of it.

§ 2. This government was first committed to the Apostles by Christ

THis government was by immediate substitution delegated to the *Apostles* by Christ himselfe, *in traditione clavium, in spiratione Spiritûs, in missione in Pentecoste.* When Christ promised them the *Keyes*, he promised them *power* to *bind* and *loose*, when he breathed on them the holy Ghost, he gave them that actually, to which by the former promise they were intitled; and in the octaves of the Passion, he gave them the same authority, which he had received from his Father, and they were the *faithfull and wise stewards whom the Lord made* RULERS *over his Houshold.* * But I shall not labour much upon this. Their founding all the Churches from East to West, and so, by being Fathers, derived their authority from the nature of the thing, their appointing rulers in every Church, their Synodall decrees *de Suffocato & Sanguine*, and letters missive to the Churches of *Syria* and *Cilicia*, their excommunications of *Hymeneus*, *Alexander*, and the *incestuous Corinthian*, their commanding, and requiring obedience of their people in all things, as S. *Paul* did of his subjects of *Corinth*, and the *Hebrews* by precept Apostolicall, their threatning the Pastorall rod, their calling Synods and publick assemblies, their ordering rites and ceremonies,

* *vide Hilarium in hunc locum & pp. communiter.*

nies, composing a Symbole as the *tessera* of Christianity, their publick reprehension of delinquents, and indeed the whole execution of their Apostolate is one continued argument of their *superintendency*, and *superiority of jurisdiction*.

THis power so delegated was not to expire with their *Persons*; For when the Great sheapheard had reduced his wandring sheep into a fold, he would not leave them without *guides* to *governe* them, so long as the wolfe might possibly prey upon them, and that is, till the last separation of the Sheep from the Goats. And this Christ intimates in that promise, *Ero vobiscum (Apostolis) usq; ad consummationem sæculi. Vobiscum*, not with your *persons*, for they dyed long agoe, but *vobiscum & vestri similibus*, with Apostles to the end of the world. And therefore that the Apostolate might be successive and perpetuall, Christ gave them a *power of ordination*, that by imposing hands on others they might impart that *power* which they received from *Christ*. For in the Apostles there was something *extraordinary*; something *ordinary*. Whatsoever was *extraordinary*, as *immediate mission*, *unlimited jurisdiction*, and *miraculous operations*, that was not necessary to the perpetuall regiment of the Church, for then the Church should faile when these priviledges extraordinary did cease. It was not therefore in extraordinary powers and priviledges that Christ promised his perpetuall assistance; not in speaking of tongues, not in doing

§ 3. With a power of joyning others and appointing successors in the Apostolate

miracles, whether *in Materiâ censuræ*, as delivering to Sathan; or, *in materiâ misericordiæ*, as healing sick people; or *in re Naturali*, as in resisting the venome of Vipers, and quenching the violence of flames; in these Christ did not promise perpetuall assistance, for then it had been done, and still these signes should have followed them that believe. But we see they doe not. It followes then, that in all the ordinary parts of power and office Christ did promise to be with them to the end of the world, and therefore there must remaine a power of giving faculty, and capacity to persons successively for the execution of that, in which Christ promised perpetuall assistance. For since this perpetuall assistance could not be meant of abiding with their persons, who in few years were to forsake the world, it must needs be understood of their function, which either it must be succeeded to, or else it was as temporary as their persons. But in the extraordinary priviledges of the Apostles they had no successors, therefore of necessity a succession must be constituted in the ordinary office of Apostolate. Now what is this ordinary office? Most certainly since the extraordinary (as is evident) was only a helpe for the founding and beginning, the other are such as are necessary for the perpetuating of a Church. Now in clear evidence of sence, these offices and powers are *Preaching*, *Baptizing*, *Consecrating*, *Ordaining*, and *Governing*. For these were necessary for the perpetuating of a Church, unlesse men could be Christians that were never Christned, nourished

up

up to life without the Eucharist, become Priests without calling of God and Ordination, have their sinnes pardoned without absolution, be members and parts and sonnes of a Church whereof there is no coadunation, no authority, no Governour. These the Apostles had without all Question, and whatsoever they had, they had from Christ, and these were eternally necessary, these then were the offices of the Apostolate, which Christ promised to assist for ever, and this is that which we now call the Order and Office of Episcopacy.

§ 4. This succession into the ordinary office of Apostolate is made by Bishops

FOR although *Deacons* and *Priests* have part of these offices, and therefore (though in a very limited sence) they may be called *successores Apostolorum*, to wit, in the *power of Baptizing*, *consecrating the Eucharist*, and *Preaching* (an excellent example whereof, though we have none in Scripture, yet if I mistake him not we have in *Ignatius*, calling the Colledge of Presbyters σύλλογον Ἀποστόλων, a Combination of Apostles) yet the Apostolate and Episcopacy which did communicate in all the power, and offices which were ordinary and perpetuall, are in Scripture clearely all one in ordinary ministration, and their names are often used in common to signify exactly the same ordinary function.

1. The name was borrowed from the Prophet David in the prediction of the Apostacy of *Judas*, and Surrogation of S. *Matthias*; Καὶ τὴν Ἐπισκοπὴν αὐτοῦ λάβοι ἕτερος. His *Bishoprick*, that is, his *Apostolate* For the Apostle and the Bishop are all one in name & person

stolate let another take. The same word according to the translation of the 70. is used by the Prophet *Isaiah*, in an Evangelicall prediction, καὶ δώσω τὰς ἀρχοντάς σε ἐν εἰρήνῃ, καὶ τὰς Ἐπισκόπους σε ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ. I will give thy Princes in peace, and thy *Bishops* in righteousnesse. *Principes Ecclesiæ vocat futuros Episcopos*, saith * S. *Hierome*, herein admiring Gods Majesty in the destination of such Ministers whom himselfe calls Princes. And to this issue it is cited by S. *Clement* in his famous epistle to the Corinthians. But this is no waies unusuall in Scripture. For,

* In cap. 60. Isai. v. 17.

2. S. *Iames* the Brother of our Lord is called an Apostle, and yet he was not in the number of the twelve, but he was Bishop of *Ierusalem*. 1. That S. *Iames* was called an Apostle appears by the testimony of S. *Paul*. [*But other Apostles saw I none, save Iames the Lords Brother.*] 2. That he was none of the twelve, appears also because among the twelve Apostles, there were but two *Iames's*. The sonne of *Alpheus*, and *Iames* the sonne of *Zebedee*, the Brother of *John*. But neither of these was the *Iames* whom S. *Paul* calls the Lords brother. And this S. *Paul* intimates in making a distinct enumeration of all the appearances which Christ made after the resurrection. First to *Cephas*, then to the twelve, then to the 500. Brethren, then to *Iames*, then to all the Apostles. So that here S. *Iames* is reckoned distinctly from the twelve, and they from the whole Colledge of the Apostles, for there were (it seems) more of that dignity then the twelve. But this will also safely rely upon the concurrent testimony of

1. Galat. 19.

1. Corin. 15.

Hegesip-

* *Hegesippus*, * S. *Clement*, *Eusebius*, *Epiphanius*, S. *Ambrose*, and S. *Hierome*. 3. That S. *Iames* was *Bishop* of Ierusalem, and therefore called an *Apostle*, appears by the often commemoration of his presidency, and singular eminency in holy Scripture. Priority of order is mentioned, *Galat.* 2. even before S. *Peter*, who yet was *primus Apostolorum, naturâ unus homo, Gratiâ unus Christianus, abundantiore gratiâ unus idemq; primus Apostolus*; (as S. *Austin*) yet in his own dioceſſe S. *Iames* had priority of order before him. v. 9. *And when* 1 *Iames*, 2 *Cephas*, and 3 *Iohn*, &c. Firſt *Iames* before *Cephas i.e.* S. *Peter*. S. *Iames* alſo was *preſident* of that *Synod* which the Apoſtles convocated at Ieruſalem about the Queſtion of circumciſion; as is to be ſeen * *Act.* 15. to him S. *Paul* made his addreſſe, *Act.* 21. to him the brethren carried him, where he was found ſitting in his Colledge of Presbyters, there he was alwaies reſident, and his ſeat fixt, and that he liv'd Biſhop of Ieruſalem for many years together, is clearly teſtified by all the faith of the Primitive Fathers and Hiſtorians. But of this hereafter.

* *Vide Carol. Bovium in conſtit. Apoſt. Schol Hieron. de Script. Eccl in Jacobo. & in* 1. *Galat. Epiphan. hæreſ* 78, 79.

Tract. 124. *in Iohan.*

* *Vide pag.*

3. *Epaphroditus* is called the Apoſtle of the *Philippians*. *I have ſent unto you Epaphroditus* συμέρεμον, καὶ συνεραπόντω μȣ, ὑμῶν δ ἀπόστολον, My compeere and your Apoſtle. *Gradum Apoſtolatus recepit Epaphroditus*, ſaith *Primaſius*, and what that is we are told by *Theodoret*, *dictus Philippenſium Apoſtolus à S. Paulo, quid hoc aliud niſi Epiſcopus?* Becauſe he alſo had received the office of being an A-

Philip. 2. 25.

In hunc locum uterq; & Theod. in 1. *Tim* 3.

postle among them, saith S. *Ierome* upon the same place; and it is very observeable, that those Apostles to whom our blessed Saviour gave immediate substitution are called Ἀπόστολοι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, Apostles of Iesus Christ, but those other men which were Bishops of Churches, and called Apostles by Scripture, are called Ἀπόστολοι Ἐκκλησιῶν, Apostles of Churches, or sometime Apostles, alone, but never are intitled of Iesus Christ. *Other of the Apostles saw I none but Iames the Lords Brother, Gal.* 1. There S. *Iames* the Bishop of Ierusalem is called an Apostle indefinitely. But S. *Paul* calls himselfe often the Apostle of Iesus Christ, not of man, neither by man, but by Iesus Christ. So, *Peter* an Apostle of Iesus Christ, but S. *Iames* in his Epistle to the Iewes of the dispersion, writes not himselfe the Apostle of Iesus Christ, but Δοῦλος Θεοῦ καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. *Iames* the servant of God and of the Lord Iesus Christ.

Further yet: S. *Paul*, although as having an immediate calling from Christ to the office of Apostolate at large, calls himselfe the Apostle of Iesus Christ, yet when he was sent to preach to the Gentiles by the particular direction indeed of the holy Ghost, but by Humane constitution, and imposition of hands; in relation to that part of his office, and his cure of the uncircumcision, he limits his Apostolate to his Dioceſse and calls himselfe, Ἀπόστολον ἐθνῶν, *The Apostle of the Gentiles*; as S. *Peter* for the same reason, and in the same modification is called Ἀπόστολος περιτομῆς, that is, *the Apostle of those who were*

Acts. 13. v. 2, 3.

Rom. 11. 13.

Galat. 2. 8.

of

of the Circumcision. And thus *Epaphroditus* is called the Apostle of the *Philippians*, who clearely was their Bishop (as I shall shew in the sequel) that is, he had an Apostolate limited to the Dioceſſe of Philippi. *Paulatim verò tempore procedente, & alii ab his quos Dominus elegerat ordinati sunt Apostoli, sicut ille ad Philippenses sermo declarat, dicens, necessarium autem existimo Epaphroditum, &c.* So S. *Ierome.* In proceſſe of time others beſides thoſe whom the Lord had choſen, were *ordained Apoſtles*; and particularly he inſtances in *Epaphroditus* from the authority of this inſtance, adding alſo that by the Apoſtles themſelves *Iudas* and *Silas* were called Apoſtles. In 1. cap. Gal.

4. Thus *Titus*, and ſome other with him, who came to Ieruſalem with the *Corinthian* benevolence, are called ἀπόστολοι ἐκκλησιῶν. *The Apoſtles of the Churches.* Apoſtles, I ſay, in the Epiſcopall ſence. They were none of the twelve, they were not of *immediate divine miſſion*, but of *Apoſtolike ordination*, they were actually Biſhops as I ſhall ſhew hereafter. *Titus* was Biſhop of *Crete*, and *Epaphroditus* of *Philippi*, and theſe were the Apoſtles, for *Titus* came with the *Corinthian*, *Epaphroditus* with the *Coloſsian* liberality. Now theſe men were not Ἀπόστολοι, called, *Meſſengers* in reſpect of theſe Churches *ſending* them with their contributions. 1. Becauſe they are not called the Apoſtles of theſe Churches, to wit, whoſe almes they carried, but ſimply Ἐκκλησιῶν, of the Churches, *viz.* of their own of which they were Biſhops. For if the title of [*Apoſtle*] had related 2. Corinth. 8. 23.

lated to their mission from these Churches, it is unimaginable that there should be no terme of relation expressed. 2. It is very cleare that although they did indeed carry the benevolence of the severall
Vers. 22. Churches, yet S. *Paul*, not those Churches sent them, *And we have sent with them our Brother, &c.* 3. They are called *Apostles of the Churches*, not going from *Corinth* with the mony, but before they came thither from whence they were to be di-
V. 23. spatch't in legation to *Ierusalem*. [*If any enquire of Titus .... or the Brethren, they are the Apostles of the Church, and the glory of Christ.*] So they were Apostles before they went to *Corinth*, not for their being imployed in the transportation of their charity. So that it is plaine, that their Apostolate being not relative to the Churches whose benevolence they carried, and they having Churches of their own, as *Titus* had *Crete*, *Epaphroditus* had *Philippi*, their Apostolate was a fixt residence, and superintendency of their severall Churches.

§ 5. And office, BVt in holy Scripture the identity of the ordinary office of Apostleship and Episcopacy, is cleerer yet. For when the holy Spirit had sent seaven letters
Apocal. 2. to the seaven *Asian Bishops*, the *Angell* of the Church of *Ephesus* is commended for trying them, which say they are *Apostles* and are not, and hath found them lyars. This *Angell* of the Church of *Ephesus*, as *Antiquity* hath taught us, was at that time *Timo-*
* Doroth. Synops. *thy*, or * *Gajus*, the first a *Disciple*, the other had been an entertainer of the Apostles, and either of them

them knew them well enough; it could not be that any man should dissemble their persons & counterfeit himselfe S. *Paul*, or *S. Peter*. And if they had, yet little trying was needfull to discover their folly in such a case, and whether it was *Timothy* or *Gajus* he could deserve but small commendations for the meer believing of his own eyes and memory. Besides the Apostles all were then dead, and he known to live in *Patmos*, known by the publick attestation of the sentence of relegation *ad insulam*. These men therefore dissembling themselves to be *Apostles*, must dissemble an *ordinary function*, not an *extraordinary person*. And indeed by the concurse of of story, place, and time, *Diotrephes* was the Man S. *Iohn* cheifly pointed at. For he seeing that of *Ephesus* there had been an Episcopall chayre plac'd, and *Timothy* a long while possess'd of it, and * perhaps *Gajus* after him, if we may trust *Dorotheus*, and the like in some other Churches, and that S. *Iohn* had not constituted Bishops in all the other Churches of the lesser *Asia*, but kept the Iurisdiction to be ministred by himselfe, would arrogantly take upon him to be a Bishop without Apostolicall ordination, obtruding himselfe upon the Church of *Ephesus*, so becoming ἀλλοτριεπίσκοπος, a busy man in anothers Dioceese. This, and such impostors as this the *Angell* of the Church of *Ephesus* did try, and discover, and convict, and in it he was assisted by S. *Iohn* himselfe, as is intimated in S. *Iohns* third Epistle written to this *Gajus* [v. 9.] *I wrote unto the Church* (to wit of Asia) *but Diotrephes who loveth*

* *Vide Constit. Apost. per Clement. ubi quidam Iohannes in Epheso Episc. post Timoth. collocatur.*

to have the preheminence among them receiveth us not.] Clearely this φιλοπρωτεύων would have been a *Bishop*. It was a matter of ambition, a quarrell for superintendency and preheminence that troubled him; and this also appeares further in that he exercised jurisdiction, and excommunication where he had nothing to doe, [v. 10.] *He forbids them that would receive the Brethren, and casteth them out of the Church.* So that here it is cleare, this false Apostolate, was his ambitious seeking of Episcopall preheminence and jurisdiction without lawfull ordination. Φιλοπρωτεύων Διοτρεφὴς, that was his designe, He loved to be the first in the Church, *esse Apostolum, esse Episcopum*, to be an *Apostle*, or a *Bishop*.

§ 6. Which Christ himselfe hath made distinct from Presbyters

BVt this office of the ordinary Apostleship or Episcopacy, derives its fountain from a Rock; Christs own distinguishing the Apostolate from the function of Presbyters. For when our blessed Saviour had gathered many Disciples who believed him at his first preaching, *Vocavit Discipulos suos, & elegit duodecem ex ipsis quos & Apostolos nominavit*, saith S. *Luke*. He called his Disciples, and out of them chose twelve, and called them *Apostles*. That was the first election. *Posthæc autem designavit Dominus & alios septuaginta duos.* That was his second election; the first were called *Apostles*, the second were not, and yet he *sent them* by two and two.

Luke 10.

We heare but of one commission granted them, which when they had performed and returned joy-

joyfull at their power over Divells, wee heare no more of them in the Gospell, but that their Names were written in heaven. Wee are likely therefore to heare of them after the passion, if they can but hold their owne. And so we doe. For after the Passion the Apostles gathered them together, and joyn'd them in Clericall commission by vertue of Christs first ordination of them, for a new ordination we find none in holy Scripture recorded, before we find them doing Clericall offices. *Ananias* we read baptizing of *Saul*, *Philip* the Evangelist we find preaching in *Samaria*, and baptizing his Converts; Others also we find, Presbyters at *Ierusalem*, especially at the first Councell, for there was *Iudas* sirnamed *Iustus*, and *Silas*, and S. *Marke*, and *Iohn* (a *Presbyter*, not an *Apostle* as *Eusebius* reports him) and *Simeon Cleophas* who tarried there till he was made Bishop of *Ierusalem*, these and diverse others, are reckoned to be of the number of the 72, by *Eusebius* and *Dorotheus*. *Lib.3. cap.3*

Here are plainly two offices of Ecclesiasticall Ministeries. *Apostles* and *Presbyters*, so the Scripture calls them. These were distinct, and not temporary, but succeeded to, and if so, then here is clearely a Divine institution of two Orders, and yet Deacons neither of them. Here let us fix a while.

§ 7. Giving to Apostles a power to doe some offices perpetually necessary, which to others he gave not.

1. THen; It is cleare in Scripture that the Apostles did some acts of Ministery which were necessary to be done for ever in the Church, and therefore to be committed to their Successors, which acts

acts the seventy Disciples, or Presbyters could not doe. ἐγγκρίτως ὁ αὐλὴ παρὰ τὰς λοιπὰς τάξεις εἰς ἀυτουργίαν ὁ θεῖος θεσμὸς ἀπονενέμηκε τὰς θειοτέρας ἱερουργίας, saith S. *Denis* of the Highest Order of the Hierarchy. The law of God hath reserved the Greater and Diviner Offices to the Highest Order.

Eccles. hierarch. c. 5.

As of Ordination,

First, the Apostles impos'd hands in Ordinations, which the 72 did not, the case is knowne, *Act. 6.* The Apostles called the Disciples, willing them to choose seaven men whom they might constitute in the ministration and over-sight of the poore, They did so, and set them before the twelue Apostles, so they are specified and numbred *verf. 2. cum 6.* and when they had prayed, they lay'd their hands on them. They, not the Disciples, not the 72 who were there actually present, and seaven of them were then ordayn'd to this Ministery, for they were not now ordayn'd to be διάκονοι μυστηίων, but τραπέζων, as the * Councell of *Constantinople* calls them, and that these were of the number of the 72. Disciples, *Epiphanius* bears witnesse. He sent other 72. to preach ἐξ ὧν ἦσαν οἱ ἐπὶ τὰ οἱ ἐπὶ τῶν χηρῶν τεταγμένοι, of which Number were those seaven ordained and set over the widdowes. And the same is intimated by S. *Chrysostome*, if I understand him right, ὁ ποῖον ἦ ἄρα ἀξίωμα εἶχον ἔτοι; ἢ ποίαν ἐδέξαντο χειροτονίαν ἀναγκαῖον μαθεῖν, ἄρα πλὴ τῆς διακόνων; ἢ μὴν τοῦτο ἐν ταῖς Ἐκκλησίαις ἐν ὄζιν· ἀλλὰ τῆς πρεσβυτέρων ὄζιν ἡ οἰκονομία. What dignity had these seaven here ordained? of Deacons? No; for this dispensation is made by *Priests* not *Deacons*; and *Theophylact* more clearely repeating the words

** In Trullo. can. 16.*

Hæres. 20.

Homil. 14. in Act. 6.

In hunc locũ.

words of S. *Chrysostome, pro more suo,* addes this, ἦν πρεσβυτέρων εἶναι τὸ ὄνομα εἶναι, καὶ τὸ ἀξίωμα αὐτῶν; ἀλλὰ τέως εἰς τοῦτο διακονεῖν τοῖς πιστοῖς τὰ πρὸς τὴν χρείαν ἐχειροτονήθησαν. The name and dignity of these seaven was no lesse, but even the dignity of Presbyters, only for the time they were appointed to dispense the goods of the Church for the good of the faithfull people. Presbyters they were say S. *Chrysostome* and *Theophylact*; of the number of the 72. saith *Epiphanius*. But however, it is cleare that the 72. were present, for the whole multitude of the Disciples was as yet there resident, they were not yet sent abroad, they were not scattered with persecution till the Martyrdome of S. *Stephen*, [but the twelve called the whole multitude of the Disciples] to them about this affaire. *vers.* 2. But yet themselves only did ordaine them.

2. An instance paralell to this, is in the imposition of hands upon S. *Paul* and *Barnabas*, in the first ordination that was held at *Antioch*. [Now there were in the Church that was at *Antioch* certain Prophets and Teachers, as *Barnabas* and *Simeon*, and *Lucius*, and *Manaën*, and *Saul*. λειτουργούντων δὲ αὐτῶν, while *these men* were Ministring, the holy Ghost said to *them*, separate me *Barnabas* and *Saul*.] They did so, they [fasted, they prayed, they laid their hands on them, and *sent them away*. So they being *sent forth by the holy Ghost*, departed into *Seleucia*.] This is the story, now let us make our best on't. Here then was the ordination and imposition of hands complete, and that was said to Acts. 13.

be done by the holy Ghost which was done by the Prophets of *Antioch*. For *they* sent them away, and yet the next words are, so they being sent forth by the *holy Ghost*. So that here was the thing done, and that by the Prophets alone, and that by the command of the Holy Ghost, and said to be his act. Well! but what were these Prophets? They were Prophets in the Church of *Antioch*, not such as *Agabus*, and the daughters of *Philip* the Evangelist, Prophets of prediction extraordinary, but Prophets of ordinary office and ministration, προφῆται, διδάσκαλοι, καὶ λειτουργοῦντες, Prophets and Teachers and Ministers. More then ordinary Ministers, for they were Doctors or Teachers, and that's not all, for they were Prophets too. This even at first sight is more then the ordinary office of the Presbytery. We shall see this cleare enough in S. *Paul* * where the ordinary office of Prophets is reckoned before Pastors, before Evangelists, next to Apostles that is next to such Apostles ὃς αὐτὸς ἔδωκε, as S. *Paul* here expresses it, next to those Apostles to whom Christ hath given immediate mission. And these are therefore Apostles too, Apostles *secundi ordinis*, none of the twelve, but such as S. *Iames*, and *Epaphroditus*, and *Barnabas* and S. *Paul* himselfe. To be sure they were such Prophets as S. *Paul* and *Barnabas*, for they are reckoned in the number by S. *Luke*, for here it was that S. *Paul* although he had immediate vocation by Christ, yet he had particular ordination to this Apostolate or Ministery of the Gentiles. It is evident then what Prophets these were; they were

Prophetas duplici genere intelligamus, & futura dicentes & Scripturas revelantes. S. Ambros: in 1. Corinth. 12.

* Ephes. 4.

they were at the least more then ordinary Presbyters, and therefore they impos'd hands, and they only. And yet to make the businesse up compleat, S. *Marke* was amongst them, but he impos'd no hands, he was there as the Deacon and Minister [*vers.* 5.] but he medled not, S. *Luke* fixes the whole action upon the Prophets, such as S. *Paul* himselfe was, and so did the Holy Ghost too, but neither did S. *Marke* who was an Evangelist, and one of the 72 Disciples (as he is reckoned in the Primitive Catalogues by *Eusebius* and *Dorotheus*) nor any of the Colledge of the *Antiochian* Presbyters, that were lesse then Prophets, that is, who were not more then meere Presbyters.

The summe is this: Imposition of hands is a duty & office necessary for the perpetuating of a Church, *ne Gens sit Vnius ætatis*, least it expire in one age: this power of imposition of hands for Ordination was fix't upon the *Apostles* and Apostolike men, and not communicated to the 72 *Disciples* or *Presbyters*; for the Apostles, and Apostolike men, did so *de facto*, and were commanded to doe so, and the 72 never did so, therefore this office and Ministery of the *Apostolate* is distinct, and superiour to that of *Presbyters*, and this distinction must be so continued to all ages of the Church, for the thing was not temporary but productive of issue and succession, and therefore as perpetuall as the Clergy, as the Church it selfe.

§ 8. And Confirmation,

2. THe Apostles did impose hands for confirmation of Baptized people, and this was a perpetuall act of a power to be succeeded to, and yet not communicated, nor executed by the 72, or any other *meere Presbyter*. That the Apostles did confirme Baptized people, and others of the inferiour Clergie could not, is beyond all exception cleare in the case of the *Samaritan* Christians. *Acts.* 8. For when S. *Philip* had converted, and Baptized the Men of *Samaria*, the Apostles sent *Peter* and *Iohn* to lay their hands on them that they might receive the Holy Ghost. S. *Philip* he was an Evangelist, he was one of the 72 Disciples, * a Presbyter, and appointed to the same ministration that S. *Stephen* was about the poore Widdowes, yet he could not doe this, the Apostles must and did. This giving of the Holy Ghost by imposition of the Apostles hands, was not for a miraculous gift, but an ordinary Grace. For S. *Philip* could, and did doe miracles enough, but this Grace he could not give the Grace of consigning or confirmation. The like case is in *Acts.* 19. where some people having been Baptized at *Ephesus*, S. *Paul* confirmed them, giving them the Holy Ghost by imposition of hands. The Apostles did it; not the twelue only, but Apostolike men, the other Apostles. S. *Paul* did it. S. *Philip* could not, nor any of the 72, or any other *meere Presbyters* ever did it, that we find in Holy Scripture.

* *S. Cyprian: ad Iubajan.*

Yea; but this imposition of hands, was for a Miraculous

raculous issue, for the *Ephesine* Christians received the Holy Ghost, and spake with tongues and propheſied, which effect because it is ceased, certainly the thing was temporary and long agoe expired. 1. Not for this reason to be sure. For extraordinary effects may be temporary, when the function which they attest may be eternall, and therefore are no signes of an extraordinary Ministery. The Apostles preaching was attended by Miracles, and extraordinary conversions of people [*ut in exordio, "Apostolos divinorum signorum comitabantur effectus & Spiritûs Sancti gratia, ità ut videres unâ "alloquutione integros simul populos ad cultum divi-"næ religionis adduci, & prædicantium verbis non esse "tardiorem audientium fidem,*] as * *Eusebius* tels of the succeſſe of the preaching of some Evangeliſts; yet I hope preaching must not now ceaſe because no Miracles are done, or that to convert one man now would be the greateſt Miracle. The Apoſtles when they curs'd and anathematiz'd a delinquent, he dyed ſuddainly, as in the caſe of *Ananias* and *Saphira*, whom S. *Peter* ſlew with the word of his Miniſtery, and yet now although theſe extraordinary iſſues ceaſe, it is not ſafe venturing upon the curſes of the Church. When the Apoſtles did excommunicate a ſinner, he was preſently delivered over to Sathan to be buffeted, that is, to be afflicted with corporall puniſhments, and now although no ſuch exterminating Angels beat the bodyes of perſons excommunicate, yet the power of excommunication I hope ſtill remaines in the Church, and the

* *lib: 3 hiſt: cap. 37.*

power of the Keyes is not also gone: So also in the power of *confirmation*, * which however attended by a visible miraculous descent of the Holy Ghost in gifts of languages and healing, yet like other miracles in respect of the whole integrity of Christian faith, these miracles at first did confirme the function, and the faith for ever.

* *vide August. tract. 6. in 1. Epist. Iohan.*

Now then that this right of imposing hands for confirming of baptiz'd people, was not to expire with the persons of the Apostles, appeares from these considerations.

1. Because Christ made a promise of sending *Vicarium suum Spiritum*, the Holy Ghost in his stead; and this by way of appropriation is called *the promise of the Father*; This was pertinent to all Christendome. *Effundam de spiritu meo super omnem carnem*, so it was in the Prophecy. For the promise is to you and to your Children καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς εἰς μακρὰν ὅσους ἂν προσκαλέσηται Κύριος, and *to all* them that are a farre off, even to as many as the Lord shall call. So it was in the first accomplishing. *To all.* And this *for ever*, for [I will send the Holy Ghost unto you, and he shall abide with you *for ever*] for it was *in subsidium*, to supply the comforts of his desired presence, and must therefore *ex vi intentionis* be remanent till Christ's comming againe. Now then this promise being to be communicated *to all*, and that *for ever*, must either come to us by [1] extraordinary and miraculous mission, or by [2] an ordinary Ministery. Not the first; for we might as well expect the gift of Miracles. If the second (as it is most certaine

Act. 2. 39.

certaine ſo) then the mayne Queſtion is evicted, viz: that ſomething perpetually neceſſary was in the power of the Apoſtles, which was not in the power of the inferiour Miniſters, nor of any, but themſelves and their Colleagues, to wit, *Miniſterium S. Spiritûs*, or the ordinary office of giving the holy Ghoſt by impoſition of hands. For this promiſe was performed to the Apoſtles in *Pentecoſt*, to the reſt of the faithfull after Baptiſme, *Quod n. nunc in confirmandis Neophytis manûs impoſitio tribuit ſingulis, hoc tunc ſpiritûs ſancti deſcenſio, in credentium populo donavit Vniverſis*, ſaith *Euſebius Emiſſenus*. Now we find no other way of performing it, nor any ordinary conveyance of the Spirit to all people, but this; and we find that the H. Ghoſt actually was given this way. Therefore the effect, to wit, the H. Ghoſt being to continue for ever, and the promiſe of Univerſall concernement, this way alſo of it's communication, to wit, by Apoſtolicall impoſition of hands, is alſo *perpetuum miniſterium*, to be ſucceeded to and to abide for ever. *Serm. de Pentecoſte.*

2 This Miniſtery of impoſition of hands for confirmation of baptized people is ſo farre from being a temporary Grace, and to determine with the perſons of the Apoſtles, that it is a fundamentall point of Chriſtianity, an eſſentiall ingredient to it's cõpoſition. S. *Paul* is my Author. [Therefore leaving the *principles of the doctrine of Chriſt*, let us goe on unto perfection, not laying againe the *foundation* of Repentance from dead works, faith towards God, the doctrine of baptiſme, *and of laying on of hands*. &c. Hebr. 6. 1.

&c. Here is imposition of hands reckoned as part of the foundation and a principle of Christianity in *S. Pauls* Catechisme. Now, imposition of hands is used by Name in Scripture but for two Ministrations. [1] For ordination, & [2] for this whatsoever it is. Imposition of hands for ordination does indeed give the Holy Ghost, but not as he is that promise which is called *the promise of the Father*. For the Holy Ghost for ordination was given before the ascension. *John.* 20. But the promise of the H. Ghost the comforter [the *Paraclete*, I say, not the *Ordayner or fountaine of Priestly order*, that] was not given till the day of *Pentecost*; and besides, it was promis'd to all Christian people, and the other was given onely to the Clergy.

* Adde to this, that *S. Paul* having laid this in the foundation makes his progresse from this to perfection (as he calls it) that is to higher mysteries, and then his discourse is immediately of the Priesthood Evangelicall, which is Originally in Christ, ministerially in the Clergy; so that unlesse we will either confound the termes of his progresse, or imagine him to make the Ministery of the Clergy, the foundation of Christs Priesthood, and not rather contrary, it is cleare that by imposition of hands, S. *Paul* meanes not ordination, and therefore confirmation, there being no other ordinary Ministery of imposition of hands but these two specifyed in Holy Scripture. For, as for benediction in which Christ used the ceremony, and as for healing in which *Ananias* and the Apostles us'd it; the first is clearely

no

no Principle or fundamentall point of Christianity; and the Second is confessedly extraordinary, therefore the argument is still firme upon it's first principles.

3. Lastly, the Primitive Church did *de facto*, and beleiv'd themselves to be tyed *de jure* to use this rite of Confirmation and giving of the Holy Ghost after Baptisme.

S. *Clemens Alexandrinus* in *Eusebius* tells a story of a young man whom S. *Iohn* had converted and committed to a Bishop to be brought up in the faith of Christendome, *Qui* (saith S. *Clement*) *eum baptismi Sacramento illuminavit, postea verò sigillo Domini tanquam perfectâ & tutâ ejus animi custodiâ obsignavit.* The Bishop first baptiz'd him, then consign'd him. *Iustin Martyr* saies (speaking *pro more Ecclesiæ*, according to the Custome of the Church) that when the mysteries of baptisme were done, then the faithfull are consign'd, or confirm'd.

lib: 3. hist: cap. 17.

Quæst. 137. ad Orthod:

S. *Cyprian* relates to this story of S. *Philip* and the Apostles, and gives this account of the whole affayre, *Et idcircò quia legitimum & Ecclesiasticum baptismum consequuti fuerant, baptizari eos ultrà non oportebat; Sed tantummodò id quod deerat, id à Petro & Iohanne factum erat, ut oratione pro eis habitâ & manu impositâ invocaretur, & infunderetur super eos Spiritus S. Quod nunc quoq; apud nos geritur, ut qui in Ecclesiâ baptizantur, Præpositis Ecclesiæ offerantur, ut per nostram orationem ac manûs impositionem Spiritum S. consequantur, & signaculo Dominico confirmentur.* S. *Peter* and S. *Iohn*

Epist: 73. ad Iubajan:

by imposing their hands on the Converts of *Samaria*, praying over them, and giving them the Holy Ghost, made supply to them of what was wanting after Baptisme: and this is to this day done in the Church, for new baptized people are brought to the Bishops, and by imposition of their hands obtaine the Holy Ghost.

But for this who pleases to be farther satisfied in the Primitive faith of Christendome, may see it in the decretall Epistles of *Cornelius* the Martyr to *Fabianus* recorded by *Eusebius*; in the * Epistle written to *Iulius* and *Iulianus* Bishops, under the name of S. *Clement*, in the * Epistle of *Vrban* P. and Martyr, [a] in *Tertullian*, in [b] S. *Austen*, and in S. *Cyrill* of *Ierusalem* whose whole third *Mistagogique* Catechisme is concerning Confirmation. This only. The Catholicks, whose Christian prudence it was, in all true respects to disadvantage Hereticks, least their poyson should infect like a Pest, layd it in *Novatus* dish as a crime, *He was baptized in his bed, and was not confirmed*, *Vnde nec Spiritum sanctum unquam potuerit promereri*, therefore he could never receive the gift of the holy Ghost. So *Cornelius* in the forequoted Epistle. Whence it is evident, that then it was the beliefe of Christendome, that the holy Ghost was by no *ordinary* ministery given to faithfull people after Baptisme, but only by *Apostolicall*, or *Episcopall* consignation and imposition of hands.

What also the faith of Christendome was concerning the *Minister* of confirmation, and that *Bi-*

* *Lib. 6. hist. cap. 33.* * *in 1. tom. Concil:* [a] *lib. de baptismo c. 8.* [b] *lib. 2. contra lit: Petil: cap. 104. & lib. 15. de Trinit: c. 26. vide etiam S. Hieron: contra Luciferianos, S. Ambros: lib. 2. c. 2. de sacramentis Epist: 3. Eusebij P. & M. ad Episc. Tusciæ & Campon: Isidor: Hispal de eccles: offic. lib. 2. c. 26.*

Bishops

shops only could doe it, I shall make evident in the descent of this discourse. Here the Scene lies in Scripture, where it is cleare that S. *Philip*, one of the 72. *Disciples*, as antiquity reports him, and an Evangelist and a *Disciple*, as Scripture also expresses him, could not impose hands for application of the promise of the Father, and ministeriall giving of the holy Ghost, but the Apostles must goe to doe it; and also there is no example in Scripture of any that ever did it but an Apostle, and yet this is an ordinary Ministery which *de jure* ought, & *de facto* alwaies was continued in the Church. Therefore there must alwaies be an ordinary office of Apostleship in the Church to doe it, that is, an office above Presbyters, for in Scripture they could never doe it, and this is it which we call *Episcopacy*.

§ 9. And Superiority of Iurisdiction.

3. THe Apostles were rulers of the whole Church, & each Apostle respectively of his severall Dioceſe, when he would fixe his chaire; & had superintendency over the Presbyters, and the people, and this by Christs donation, the Charter is by the Fathers said to be this. *Sicut misit me Pater, sic ego mitto vos.* As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. *Manifesta enim est sententia Domini nostri Iesu Christi Apostolos suos mittentis, & ipsis solis potestatem à Patre sibi datam permittentis quibus nos succesimus eâdem potestate Ecclesiam Domini gubernantes*, said *Clarus à Musculâ*, the Bishop in the Councell of *Carthage* related by S. *Cyprian* and S. *Austin*. But however it is evident in Scripture

Iohn. 20. 21.

Lib. 7. *de baptism. Contra Donatist. c.* 43. *vide etiam* S. Cyprian, *de Unit. Eccles. &* S. Cyrill. *in Ioh. lib.* 12. *c.* 55.

Scripture, that the Apostles had such superintendency over the inferior Clergy (Presbyters I mean and Deacons) and a superiority of jurisdiction, and therefore it is certain that Christ gave it them for none of the Apostles took this honour, but he that was called of God as was *Aaron*.

1. Our blessed Saviour gave to the Apostles *plenitudinem potestatis*. It was *sicut misit me Pater, &c.* As my Father sent, so I send. You, my Apostles whom I have chosen. This was not said to Presbyters, for they had no commission at all given to them by Christ, but at their first mission to preach repentance, I say no commission at all, they were not spoken to, they were not present. Now then consider. Suppose that as *Aërius* did deny the Divine institution of Bishops over the Presbyters *cum grege*, another as confident as he should deny the Divine institution of Presbyters, what proof were there in all the holy Scripture to shew the Divine institution of them as a distinct order from Apostles or Bishops. Indeed Christ selected 72 and gave them commission to preach, but that commission was temporary and expired before the crucifixion for ought appeares in Scripture. If it be said the Apostles did ordaine Presbyters in every City, it is true, but not sufficient, for so they ordained Deacons at *Ierusalem*, and in all established Churches, and yet this will not tant'amount to an immediate Divine institution for Deacons, and how can it then for Presbyters? If we say a constant Catholick traditive interpretation of Scripture, does

teach

teach us, that Christ did institute the *Presbyterate* together with *Episcopacy*, and made the Apostles Presbyters as well as Bishops; this is true. But then 1. We recede from the plain words of Scripture, and rely upon tradition, which in this question of Episcopacy will be of dangerous consequence to the enimies of it, for the same tradition, if that be admitted for good probation, is for Episcopall preheminence over Presbyters, as will appeare in the sequel. 2. Though no use be made of this advantage, yet to the allegation it will be quickly answered, that it can never bee proved from Scripture, that Christ made the Apostles Priests first, and then Bishops or Apostles, but only that Christ gave them severall commissions, and parts of the office Apostolicall, all which being in one person, cannot by force of Scripture prove two orders. Truth is, if we change the scene of warre, and say that the *Presbyterate*, as a distinct order from the ordinary office of Apostleship, is not of Divine institution, the proof of it would be harder then for the Divine institution of *Episcopacy*. Especially if we consider, that in all the enumerations of the parts of Clericall offices, there is no enumeration of *Presbyters*, but of *Apostles* there is; and the other members of the induction are of guifts of Christianity, or parts of the Apostolate, and either must inferre many more orders, then the Church ever yet admitted of, or none, distinct from the Apostolate, insomuch as Apostles were Pastors, and Teachers, and Evangelists, and Rulers, and had the guift of tongues, of

Ephes. 4. 1. Corinth. 12.

healing, and of Miracles. This thing is of great consideration, and this use I will make of it: That either Christ made the 72 to be Presbyters, and in them instituted the distinct order of Presbyterate, as the ancient Church alwaies did believe, or else he gave no distinct commission for any such distinct order. If the second be admitted, then the Presbyterate is not of *immediate divine* institution, but of *Apostolicall* only, as is the Order of Deacons, and the whole plenitude of power is in the order Apostolicall alone, and the Apostles did constitute Presbyters with a greater portion of their own power, as they did Deacons with a lesse. But if the first be said, then the commission to the 72 Presbyters being only of preaching that we find in Scripture, all the rest of their power which now they have is by Apostolicall ordinance, and then although the Apostles did admit them *in partem sollicitudinis*, yet they did not admit them *in plenitudinem potestatis*, for then they must have made them Apostles, and then there will be no distinction of order neither by *Divine* nor *Apostolicall* institution neither.

I care not which part be chosen, one is certain, but if either of them be true, then since to the Apostles only, Christ gave a *plenitude* of power, it followes, that either the Presbyters have no power of jurisdiction, as affixed to a distinct order, and then the Apostles are to rule them by vertue of the order and ordinary commission Apostolicall; or if they have jurisdiction they doe derive it *à fonte Apostolorum*

rum, and then the Apostles have superiority of Iurisdiction over Presbyters, because Presbyters only have it by delegation Apostolicall. And that I say truth (besides that there is no possibility of shewing the contrary in Scripture, by the producing any other commission given to Presbyters, then what I have specified,) I will hereafter shew it to have been the faith and practise of Christendome not only that Presbyters were *actually subordinate* to Bishops (which I contend to be the ordinary office of Apostleship) but that Presbyters have no Iurisdiction *essentiall* to their order, but *derivative* only from Apostolicall preheminence.

2. Let us now see the *matter of fact*. They that can inflict censures upon Presbyters have certainly superiority of Iurisdiction over Presbyters, for *Æqualis æqualem coercere non potest*, saith the Law. Now it is evident in the case of *Diotrephes* a Presbyter, and a Bishop *Would be*, that for his peremptory rejection of some faithfull people from the Catholick communion without cause, and without authority, S. *Iohn* the Apostle threatned him in his Epistle to *Gajus*, διὰ τοῦτο ἐὰν ἔλθω ὑπομνήσω αὐτοῦ &c. *Wherefore when I come I will remember him*, and all that would have been to very little purpose, if he had not had *coercitive* jurisdiction to have punish't his delinquency.

3. Presbyters many of them did succeed the Apostles by a new ordination, as *Matthias* succeeded *Iudas*, who before his new ordination was one of the 72. as [a] *Eusebius*, [b] *Epiphanius*, and [c] S. *Ierome* affirme

a Lib. 1. *hist.* c 12. & l. 2. c. 9.
b Hæres. 20.
c *De script. Eccles. in Matth.* *vide* Irenæum l. 4. c. 63. Tertul de præscript.

affirme, and in Scripture is expressed to be of the number of them that went in and out with Iesus; S. *Clement* succeeded S. *Peter* at *Rome*, S. *Simeon Cleophæ* succeeded S. *Iames* at *Ierusalem*, S. *Philip* succeeded S. *Paul* at *Cæsarea*, & diverse others of the 72, reckoned by *Dorotheus*, *Eusebius*, & others of the Fathers, did governe the severall Churches after the Apostles death which before they did not. Now it is cleare that he that receives no more power after the Apostles, then he had under them, can no way be said to succeed them in their Charge, or Churches. It followes then, since (as will more fully appeare anon) Presbyters did succeed the Apostles, that under the Apostles they had not such jurisdiction as afterwards they had. But the Apostles had the same to which the Presbyters succeeded to, therefore greater then the Presbyters had before they did succeed. When I say Presbyters succeeded the Apostles, I meane, not as *Presbyters*, but by a new ordination to the dignity of *Bishops*, so they succeeded, and so they prove an evidence of fact, for a superiority of Iurisdiction in the Apostolicall Clergy. *** Now that this superiority of Iurisdiction was not temporary, but to be succeeded in, appeares from Reason, and from ocular demonstration, or of the thing done.

1. If superiority of Iurisdiction was necessary in the ages Apostolicall for the regiment of the Church, there is no imaginable reason why it should not be necessary in succession, since upon the emergency of Schismes and Heresies which were foretold

foretold should multiply in descending ages, government and superiority of jurisdiction, unity of supremacy, and coërcion was more necessary then at first, when extraordinary gifts might supply, what now we expect to be performed by an ordinary authority.

2. Whatsoever was the regiment of the Church in the Apostles times that must be perpetuall (not so as to have * *all* that which was personall, and temporary, but so as to have *no other*) for that, and that only is of Divine institution which Christ committed to the Apostles, and if the Church be not now governed as then, We can shew no Divine Authority for our government, which we must contend to doe, and doe it too, or be call'd usurpers. For either the Apostles did governe the Church as Christ commanded them, or not. If not, then they fayl'd in the founding of the Church, and the Church is not built upon a Rock. If they did (as most certainly they did) then either the same disparity of jurisdiction must be retayn'd, or else we must be governed with an Unlawfull and unwarranted equality, because not by that which only is of immediate divine institution; and then it must needs be a fine government, where there is no authority, and where no man is superiour.

* *Ut puta, viduarum collegium, & Diaconorum, & cœnobium fidelium. &c.*

3. We see a disparity in the Regiment of Churches warranted by Christ himselfe, and confirmed by the Holy Ghost in fayrest intimation. I meane the seaven Angel-Presidents of the seaven *Asian* Churches. If these seaven *Angels* were seaven

Bishops, that is, Prelates or Governours of these seaven Churches, in which it is evident and confessed of all sides, there were many Presbyters, when it is certaine that a Superiority of Iurisdiction was intended by Christ himselfe, and given by him, insomuch as he is the fountaine of all power derived to the Church; For Christ writes to these seaven Churches, and directs his Epistles to the seaven Governours of these Churches calling them Angels, which it will hardly be suppos'd he would have done, if the function had not been a ray of the Sunne of righteousnesse, they had not else been Angels of light, nor starres held in Christ's owne right hand.

This is certaine, that the function of these Angels (whatsoever it be) is a Divine institution. Let us then see what is meant by these starres and Angels. [*The seaven starres are the Angells of the seaven Churches, and the seaven Candlesticks are the seaven Churches.*]

Revel. 1. vers. 20.

1. Then it is evident, that although the Epistles were sent with a finall intention for the edification and confirmation of the whole Churches or people of the Dioceese, with an [*Attendite quid Spiritus dicit Ecclesijs*] yet the personall direction was not to the whole Church, for the whole Church is called the *Candlestick*, and the superscription of the Epistles is not to the seaven *Candlesticks*, but to the seaven *starres* which are the Angels of the seaven Churches, *viz.* the lights shining in the Candlesticks. By the Angell therefore is not, cannot be meant the *whole Church*.

2. It

2. It is plaine that by the *Angel* is mean't the *Governour* of the Church, 1. Because of the title of eminency, *The Angel* κατ' ἐξοχὴν, that is, the Messenger, the Legate, the Apostle of the Church. Ἄγγελοι ἐκκλησιῶν. For these words, *Angel*, or *Apostle*, although they signifie Mission or Legation, yet in Scripture they often relate to the persons to whom they are sent. As in the examples before specified. Ἄγγελοι ἐκκλησιῶν. Their Angels. Ἀπόστολοι Ἐκκλησιῶν. The Apostles of the Churches. Ἄγγελος τῆς Ἐφεσίνης Ἐκκλησίας. The Angel of the Church of *Ephesus*, and diverse others. Their compellation therefore being a word of *office* in respect of him that sends them, and of *Eminence* in relation to them to whom they are sent, shewes that the Angel was the Ruler of each Church respectively. 2. Because acts of jurisdiction are concredited to him; as, not to suffer *false Apostles*; So to the Angel of the Church of *Ephesus*, which is clearly a power of cognisance and coërcion *in causis Clericorum*: to be *watchfull* and *strengthen* the things that remaine; as to the Angel of the Church in *Sardis*, γίνου γρηγορῶν, καὶ στήριξον τὰ λοιπά. The *first* is the office of Rulers, for they *Watch* for your Soules; And the *second*, of Apostles, and Apostolike men. Ἰούδας καὶ Σίλας τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς ἐπεστήριξαν, *Iudas* and *Silas* confirm'd the Brethren, for these men, although they were but of the 72 at first, yet by this time were made Apostles and [cheife men among the Brethren] S. *Paul* also was joyned in this worke, διήρχετο ἐπιστηρίζων τὰς Ἐκκλησίας, He *went up and downe confirming the Churches*. And τὰ λοιπὰ διατάξομαι. S. *Paul*. To confirme

Hebr. 13.

Act. 15.

1. Cor. 11.

firme the Churches, and to make supply of what is deficient in discipline and government, these were offices of power and jurisdiction, no lesse then Episcopall or Apostolicall; and besides, the Angel here spoken of had a propriety in the people of the Diocesse [*Thou hast a few names even in Sardis*] they were the Bishops people, the Angel had a right to them. And good reason that the people should be his, for their faults are attributed to him, as to the Angel of *Pergamus*, and diverse others, and therefore they are deposited in his custody, He is to be their Ruler and Pastor, and this is called *his Ministery*. To the Angel of the Church of *Thyatira* οἶδά σου τὰ ἔργα, καὶ τὴν διακονίαν, *I have knowne thy Ministery*. His office therefore was *Clericall*, it was an Angel-Minister, and this his office must make him the guide and superiour to the Rest, even all the whole Church, since he was charg'd with all.

3. By the Angel is mean't a singular person, for the reprehensions and the commendations respectively imply personall delinquency, or suppose personall excellencyes. Adde to this that the compellation is singular, and of determinate number, so that we may as well multiply Churches as persons, for the seaven Churches had but seaven starres, and these seaven starres were the Angels of the seaven Churches. And if by seaven starres they may meane 70 times seaven starres (for so they may if they begin to multiply) then by one starre they must meane many starres, and so they may multiply Churches too, for there were as many Churches as

as starres, and no more Angels then Churches, and it is as reasonable to multiply these seaven Churches into 7000, as every *starre* into a *Constellation*, or every *Angel* into a *Legion*.

But besides the Exigency of the thing it selfe, these seaven Angels are by Antiquity called the seaven Governours or Bishops of the seaven Churches, & their very names are commemorated. Vnto these seaven Churches S. *Iohn*, saith *Arethas*, reckoneth ἰσαρίθμους ἐφόρους Ἀγγέλους, an equall number of Angel-Governours, and *Oecumenius* in his *scholia* upon this place, saith the very same words. *Septem igitur Angelos Rectores septem Ecclesiarum debemus intelligere, eò quòd Angelus Nuntius interpretatur*, saith S. *Ambrose*, and againe, *Angelos Episcopos dicit sicut docetur in Apocalypsi Iohannis*. Let the woman have a covering on her head *because of the Angels*, that is, in reverence and subjection to the Bishop of the Church, for Bishops are the Angels as is taught in the *Revelation* of S. *Iohn*. *Divinâ voce sub Angeli Nomine laudatur præpositus Ecclesiæ* so S. *Austin*. By the voyce of God the Bishop of the Church is commended under the title of an Angel. *Eusebius* names some of these Angels who were then Presidents and actually Bishops of these Churches. S. *Policarpe* was one to be sure, *apud Smyrnam & Episcopus & Martyr*, saith *Eusebius*, He was the Angel of the Church of *Smyrna*; And he had good authority for it, for he reports it out of *Polycrates* who a little after, was himselfe an Angell of the Church of *Ephesus*, and he also

in 1. Apocal.

ibid.

in 1. Cor. 11.

Epist. 162. *& in* Apocal.

lib. 5. c. 24.

lib. 4 c. 10.

quotes S. *Irenæus* for it, & out of the Encyclicall Epistle of the Church of *Smyrna* it selfe, and besides these authorities it is attested by S. † *Ignatius*, and * *Tertullian*. S. *Timothy* was another Angell, to wit, of the Church of *Ephesus*; to be sure had beene, and most likely was still surviving. *Antipas* is reckoned by Name in the Revelation, and he had been the Angel of *Pergamus*, but before this booke written he was turned from an *Angel* to a *Saint*. *Melito* in all probability was then the Angel of the Church of *Sardis*. *Melito quoq; Sardensis Ecclesiæ Antistes, & Apollinaris apud Hierapolim Ecclesiam regens celeberrimi inter cæteros habebantur*, saith *Eusebius*. These men were actually living when S. *John* writ his Revelation, for *Melito* writ his book *de Paschate* when *Sergius Paulus* was Proconsul of *Asia*, and writ after the Revelation, for he writ a treatise of it, as saith *Eusebius*. However, at least some of these were then, and all of these about that time were Bishops of these Churches, and the Angels S. *John* speakes of were such who had Iurisdiction over their whole Diocesse, therefore these, or such as these were the Angels to whom the Spirit of God writ hortatory and commendatory letters, such whom Christ held in his Right hand and fix'd them in the Churches like lights set on a Candlestick that they might give shine to the whole house.

lib. 4. cap. 15.

† Epist. ad Policarp.

* de præscrip.

vide Aretha. in 1. Apoc.

lib. 4. cap. 26.

The *Summe* of all is this; that Christ did institute Apostles and Presbyters or 72 Disciples. To the Apostles he gave a *plenitude* of power, for the whole commission was given to them in as great and

and comprehenſive clauſes as were imaginable, for by vertue of it, they received a power of giving the Holy Ghoſt in confirmation, and of giving his grace in the collation of holy Orders, a power of juriſdiction and authority to governe the Church: and this power was not *temporary*, but *ſucceſsive* and *perpetuall*, and was intended as an *ordinary* office in the Church, ſo that the *ſucceſſors* of the Apoſtles had the ſame right and inſtitution that the Apoſtles *themſelves* had, and though the *perſonall* miſſion was not immediate, as of the Apoſtles it was, yet the commiſſion and inſtitution of the *function* was all one. But to the 72 Chriſt gave no commiſſion but of *preaching*, which was a very limited commiſſion. There was all the immediate Divine inſtitution of Presbyterate as a diſtinct order, that can be fairely pretended. But yet farther, theſe 72 the Apoſtles did admit *in partem ſollicitudinis*, and by new ordination or delegation Apoſtolicall, did give them power of adminiſtring Sacraments, of abſolving ſinners, of governing the Church in conjunction and ſubordination to the Apoſtles, of which they had a capacity by Chriſts calling them at firſt *in ſortem Miniſterii*, but the exercise, and the actuating of this capacity they had from the Apoſtles. So that not by *Divine* ordination, or *immediate* commiſſion from Chriſt, but by *derivation* from the *Apoſtles* (and therefore in minority and ſubordination to them) the Presbyters did exerciſe acts of order and juriſdiction in the abſence of the Apoſtles or Biſhops, or in conjunction conſiliary,

and

and by way of advice, or before the consecration of a Bishop to a particular Church. And all this I doubt not, but was done by the direction of the Holy Ghost, as were all other acts of Apostolicall ministration, and particularly the institution of the other order, *viz.* of Deacons. This is all that can be proved out of Scripture concerning the commission given in the institution of Presbyters, and this I shall afterwards confirme by the practise of the Catholick Church, and so vindicate the practises of the *present* Church, from the common prejudices that disturbe us, for by this account, *Episcopacy* is not only a *Divine institution*, but the *only* order that derives *immediately* from Christ.

For the present only, I summe up this with that saying of *Theodoret* speaking of the 72 Disciples. *Palmæ sunt isti qui nutriuntur ac erudiuntur ab Apostolis. Nam quanquam Christus hos etiam elegit, erant tamen duodecem illis inferiores, & posteà illorum Discipuli & sectatores.* The Apostles are the twelve fountaines, and the 72 are the palmes that are nourished by the waters of those fountaines. For though Christ also ordain'd the 72, yet they were inferior to the Apostles, and afterwards were their followers and Disciples.

In Lucæ cap. 10.

I know no objection to hinder a conclusion, only two or three words out of *Ignatius*, are pretended against the maine question, *viz.* to prove that he, although a Bishop, yet had no Apostolicall authority, οὐχ' ὡς Ἀπόστολος διατάσσομαι, *I doe not command this as an Apostle* (*for what am I, and what is my Father's*

Epist. ad Philadelph.

Fathers houſe, that I ſhould compare my ſelfe with them) but as your fellow ſouldier and a Monitor. But this anſwers it ſelfe, if we conſider to whom he ſpeakes it. Not to his own Church of *Antioch*, for there he might command as an Apoſtle, but to the *Philadelphians* he might not, they were no part of his Dioceſſe, he was not *their* Apoſtle, and then becauſe he did not equall the Apoſtles in their commiſſion extraordinary, in their perſonall priviledges, and in their univerſall juriſdiction, therefore he might not command the *Philadelphians*, being another Biſhops charge, but admoniſh them with the freedome of a Chriſtian Biſhop, to whom the ſoules of all faithfull people were deare and precious. So that ſtill Epiſcopacy and Apoſtolate may be all one in *ordinary office*, this hinders not, and I know nothing elſe pretended, and that Antiquity is clearely on this ſide, is the next buſineſſe.

For, hitherto the diſcourſe hath been of the *immediate Divine inſtitution* of Epiſcopacy, by arguments derived from *Scripture*; I ſhall only adde two more from *Antiquity*, and ſo paſſe on to *tradition Apoſtolicall.*

§ 10. So that Biſhops are ſucceſſors in the office of Apoſtleſhip, according to the generall tenent of Antiquity.

1. THE beliefe of the primitive Church is, that Biſhops are the ordinary ſucceſſors of the Apoſtles, and Presbyters of the 72, and therefore did believe that *Epiſcopacy* is as truly of *Divine inſtitution* as the *Apoſtolate*, for the ordinary office both of one and the other is the ſame thing. For this there is abundant teſtimony. Some I ſhall ſe-

lect, enough to give faire evidence of a Catholick tradition.

Lib. 3. cap. 3. S. *Irenæus* is very frequent and confident in this particular, *Habemus annumerare eos qui ab Apostolis instituti sunt Episcopi in Ecclesiis*, ET SUCCESSORES EORUM *usq; ad nos ... Etenim si recondita mysteria sciissent Apostoli ... his vel maximè tradiderent ea quibus etiam ipsas Ecclesias committebant ... quos & SUCCESSORES relinquebant* SUUM IPSORUM LOCUM MAGISTERII *tradentes. We can name the men the Apostles made Bishops in their severall Churches, appointing them their successors, and most certainly those mysterious secrets of Christianity which themselves knew; they would deliver to them to whom they committed the Churches, and left to be their successors in the same power and authority themselves had.*

Lib. de præscript. c. 36. *Tertullian* reckons *Corinth, Philippi, Thessalonica, Ephesus* and others to be Churches Apostolicall, *apud quas ipsæ adhuc Cathedræ Apostolorum suis locis præsident.* Apostolicall they are from their foundation, and by their succession, for Apostles did found them, and Apostles, or men of Apostolick authority still doe governe them.

Epist. 42. ad Cornelium. S. *Cyprian; Hoc enim vel maximè Fratres, & laboramus & laborare debemus ut Vnitatem à Domino, & per Apostolos* NOBIS SUCCESSORIBUS *traditam quantùm possumus obtinere curemus. We must preserve the Vnity commanded us by Christ, and delivered by his Apostles to us their Successors. To us Cyprian* and *Cornelius*, for they only were then in view,

the

the one Bishop of *Rome*, the other of *Carthage*. And in his Epistle *ad Florentium Pupianum; Nec hæc jacto, sed dolens profero, cum te Iudicem Dei constituas & Christi, qui dicit ad Apostolos ac per hoc ad omnes præpositos qui Apostolis Vicariâ ordinatione succedunt, qui vos audit, me audit, &c. Christ said to his Apostles, and in them to the Governours or Bishops of his Church who succeeded the Apostles as Vicars in their absence, he that heareth you heareth mee.* Epist. 69.

Famous is that saying of *Clarus à Musculâ* the Bishop, spoken in the Councell of *Carthage* and repeated by S. *Austin*, *Manifesta est sententia Domini nostri Iesu Christi Apostolos suos mittentis & ipsis solis potestatem à patre sibi datam permittentis, quibus nos successimus eâdem potestate Ecclesiam Domini gubernantes. Nos successimus. We succeed the Apostles governing the Church by the same power.* He spake it in full Councell in an assembly of Bishops, and himselfe was a Bishop. Lib. 7. c. 43. de baptis. cont. Donatist.

The Councell of *Rome* under S. *Sylvester* speaking of the honour due to Bishops expresses it thus, *Non oportere quenquam Domini Discipulis, id est, Apostolorum successoribus detrahere. No man must detract from the Disciples of our Lord, that is, from the Apostles successors.*

S. *Hierome* speaking against the *Montanists* for undervaluing their Bishops, shewes the difference of the Catholicks honouring, and the Hereticks disadvantaging that sacred order. *Apud nos* (saith he) *Apostolorum locum Episcopi tenent, apud eos Episcopus tertius est. Bishops with us* [Catholicks] *have* Epist. 54.

the place or authority of Apostles, but with them [Montanists] *Bishops are not the first but the third state of Men.* And upon that of the Psalmist, *pro Patribus nati sunt tibi filii*, S. *Hierome*, and diverse others of the Fathers make this glosse, *Pro Patribus Apostolis filii Episcopi ut Episcopi Apostolis tanquam filii Patribus succedant; The Apostles are Fathers, instead of whom Bishops doe succeed, whom God hath appointed to be made Rulers in all lands.* So S. *Hierome*, S. *Austin*, and *Euthymius* upon the 44. *Psal. aliàs* 45.

De verbis Dom. serm. 24 But S. *Austin* for his own particular makes good use of his succeeding the Apostles, which would doe very well now also to be considered. *Si solis Apostolis dixit, qui vos spernit me spernit, spernite nos: si autem sermo ejus pervenit ad nos, & vocavit nos, & in eorum loco constituit nos, videte ne spernatis nos.* It was good counsell not to despise Bishops, for they being in the Apostles places and offices are concerned and protected by that saying, *he that despiseth you, despiseth mee.* I said it was good counsell, especially if besides all these, we will take also S. *Chrysostomes* testimony, *Potestas anathematizandi ab Apostolis ad successores eorum nimirum Episcopos transiit. A power of anathematizing delinquents is derived from the Apostles to their successors, even to Bishops.*

In Ephes. 4. S. *Ambrose* upon that of S. *Paul Ephes.* 4. *Quosdam dedit Apostolos, Apostoli Episcopi sunt,* He hath

In 1. *Corinth.* 12. 28. given *Apostles*, that is, he hath given some *Bishops.* That's down right, and this came not by chance from

from him; he doubles his assertion. *Caput itaq; in Ecclesiâ Apostolos posuit, qui legati Christi sunt, sicut dicit idem Apostolus* [*pro quo legatione fungimur.*] *Ipsi sunt Episcopi, firmante istud Petro Apostolo, & dicente inter cætera de Iudâ, & Episcopatum ejus accipiat alter.* And a third time. *Numquid omnes Apostoli? verum est; Quia in Ecclesiâ Vnus est Episcopus.* Bishop and Apostle was all one with S. *Ambrose*, when hee spake of their ordinary offices; which puts me in mind of the fragment of *Polycrates* of the Martyrdome of *Timothy* in *Photius*, ὅτι ὁ Ἀπόστολος Τιμόθεος ἦν ἡ μεγάλη Παῦλε καὶ χειροτονεῖ τῆς Ἐφησίων μητροπόλεως ἐπίσκοπος, καὶ ἐνδεδύκεται. The Apostle *Timothy* was ordained Bishop in the Metropolis of *Ephesus* by S. *Paul*, and there enthron'd. To this purpose are those compellations and titles of Bishopricks usually in antiquity. S. *Basil* calls a Bishoprick, περιοδίαν τῆς Ἀποστόλων, and περιοδίαν Ἀποστολικὴν. So *Theodoret*. An Apostolicall presidency. The summe is the same which S. *Peter* himselfe taught the Church, as S. *Clement* his Scholler, or some other primitive man in his name reports of him. *Episcopos ergo vicem Apostolorum gerere Dominum docuisse dicebat, & reliquorum Discipulorum vicem tenere Presbyteros debere insinuabat.* *He* [Peter] *said that our Lord taught that Bishops were to succeed in the place of the Apostles, and Presbyters in the place of the Disciples.* Who desires to be farther satisfied concerning Catholick consent, for Bishops succession to Apostles in their order and ordinary office, he may see it in [a] *Pacianus* the renowned

In vers. 29. ibid.

Biblioth. Phot. n. 254.

Lib. 4. c. 18.

Epist. 1.

[a] *Epist. 1. ad Simpron.*

ned Bishop of *Barcinona*, in [b] S. *Gregory*, [c] S. *John Damascen*, in S. *Sixtus* the first his second decretall Epistle, and most plentifully in [d] S. *Celestine* writing to the *Ephesine* Councell, in the Epistle of [e] *Anacletus de Patriarchis & Primatibus &c.* In [f] *Isidore*, and in [g] Venerable *Bede*. His words are these, *sicut duodecem Apostolos formam Episcoporum exhibere simul & demonstrare nemo est qui dubitet: ic & 72 figuram Presbyterorum gessisse sciendum est, tametsi primis Ecclesiæ temporibus, ut Apostolica Scriptura testis est, utriq; Presbyteri, & utriq; vocabantur Episcopi, quorum unum scientiæ maturitatem, aliud industriam curæ Pastoralis significat. Sunt ergo jure Divino Episcopi à Presbyteris prælatione distincti. As no man doubts but Apostles were the order of Bishops; so the 72 of Presbyters, though at first they had names in common. Therefore Bishops by Divine right are distinct from Presbyters, and their Prelates or Superiours.*

b *Homil.* 26. *in Evang.*
c *Orat.* 2. *de imagin.*
d *Epist.* 7.
e *Habetur Can. in Novo distinct.* 21.
f *In Synod. Hispal.*
g *Lib.* 3. *c.* 15. *super Lucam.*

§ 11. And particularly of S. Peter,

TO the same issue drive all those testimonies of Antiquity that call all Bishops *ex æquo* successors of S. *Peter*. So S. *Cyprian*. *Dominus noster cujus præcepta metuere & observare debemus, Episcopi honorem & Ecclesiæ suæ rationem disponens in Evangelio, loquitur & dicit Petro, ego tibi dico, Quia tu es Petrus, &c. Inde per temporum & successionum vices, Episcoporum ordinatio & Ecclesiæ ratio decurrit, ut Ecclesia super Episcopos constituatur, &c. When our B. Saviour was ordering his Church and instituting Episcopall dignity, he said to Peter, thou art Peter,* and

Epist. 27. *ad Lapsos.*

and on this rock will I build my Church. Hence comes the order of Bishops, and the constitution or being of the Church, that the Church be founded upon Bishops. &c.

The same also S *Ierome* intimates, *Non est facile stare loco Pauli, tenere gradum Petri. It is not a small thing, to stand in the place of Paul, to obtaine the degree of Peter,* so he, while he disswades *Heliodorus* from taking on him the great burden of the Episcopall office. *Pasce oves meas,* said *Christ* to *Peter,* and *feed the flock of God which is amongst you* said S. *Peter* to the Bishops of *Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia,* and *Bithynia. Similia enim Successoribus suis Petrus scripsit præcepta,* saith *Theodoret,* S. *Peter gave the same precepts to his successors which Christ gave to him;* And S. *Ephrem* speaking of S. *Basil* the Bishop of *Cæsarea Cappadocia, & sicut rursus Petrus Ananiam & Saphiram fraudantes de precio agri enecavit: ita & Basilius, locum Petri obtinens ejusq; paritèr authoritatem libertatemq; participans, suam ipsius promissionem fraudantem Valentem redarguit ejusq; filium morte mulctavit. As* S. *Peter did to Ananias and Saphira, So Basil did to Valens and his Sonne for the same delinquency, for he had the place, liberty, and authority of* S. *Peter.*

Epist. 1.

Lib. 12. *thes. cap.* 13. *Orat. de laud. Basil.*

Thus *Gaudentius* of *Brixia* calls S. *Ambrose* the Successor of S. *Peter,* and *Gildas* sirnamed *the wise,* saith that all evill Bishops whatsoever doe with unhallowed and uncleane feete usurpe the seate of S. *Peter.* But this thing is of Catholike beleife, and of this use. If the order and office of the Apostolate be eternall & to be succeeded in, and this office Superior

tract. primâ die suæ ordinat.

Biblioth. SS. PP. tom. 5 *in Eccles. ord. in crepat.*

perior to Presbyters, and not onely of *Divine institution*, but indeed the *onely* order which can clearely show an *immediate Divine* commission for it's power and authority (as I have proved of the function Apostolicall) then those which doe succeed the Apostles in the ordinary office of Apostolate, have the same institution and authority the Apostles had, as much as the successors of the Presbyters have with the first Presbyters, and perhaps more.

For in the Apostolicall ordinations, they did not proceed as the Church since hath done. Themselves had the whole Priesthood, the whole commission of the Ecclesiasticall power and all the offices. Now they in their ordayning assistant Ministers, did not in every ordination give a distinct order, as the Church hath done since the Apostles. For they ordayned some to distinct offices, some to particular places, some to one part, some to another part of Clericall imployment, as S. *Paul* who was an Apostle yet was ordain'd by imposition of hands to goe to the Churches of the Uncircumcision, so was *Barnabas*: S. *Iohn*, and *Iames*, and *Cephas* to the Circumcision, and there was scarce any publike designe or Grand imployment but the Apostolike men had a new ordination to it, a new imposition of hands as is evident in the Acts of the Apostles. So that the Apostolicall ordinations of the inferiour Clergy were onely a giving of partilar commissions to particular men to officiate such parts of the Apostolicall calling as they would

please

please to imploy them in. Nay sometimes their ordinations were onely a delivering of Iurisdiction when the persons ordayned had the order before, as it is evident in the case of *Paul* and *Barnabas*. Of the same consideration is the institution of *Deacons* to spirituall offices, and it is very pertinent to this Question. For there is no Divine institution for these rising higher then Apostolicall ordinance; and so much there is for Presbyters as they are now authoriz'd; for such power the Apostles gave to Presbyters as they have now, and sometimes more, as to *Iudas* and *Silas*, and diverse others, who therefore were more then meere Presbyters as the word is now us'd. Acts, 13.

* The result is this. The office and order of a Presbyter is but part of the office and order of an Apostle, so is a Deacon, a lesser part, so is an Evangelist, so is a Prophet, so is a Doctor, so is a helper, or a Surrogate in Government, but these will not be called orders, every one of them will not I am sure, at least not made distinct orders by Christ, for it was in the Apostles power to give any one or all these powers to any one man, or to distinguish them into so many men, as there are offices, or to unite more or fewer of them. All these I say, clearely make not distinct orders, and why are not all of them of the same consideration? I would be answered from Grounds of Scripture. For there we fix as yet.

* Indeed the Apostles did ordaine such men, and scattered their power at first, for there was so much imployment in any one of them, as to require

one man for one office; but a while after they united all the leſſer parts of power into two ſorts of men whom the Church hath ſince diſtinguiſhed by the Names of Presbyters and Deacons, and called them two diſtinct orders. But yet if we ſpeak properly & according to the Exigence of Divine inſtitution, there is *Vnum Sacerdotium*, one Prieſthood appointed by Chriſt, and that was, the commiſſion given by Chriſt to his Apoſtles, and to their Succeſſors preciſely, and thoſe other offices of Presbyter and Deacon are but members of the Great Prieſthood, and although the power of it, is all of Divine inſtitution, as the power to baptize, to preach, to conſecrate, to abſolve, to Miniſter, yet that ſo much of it ſhould be given to one ſort of men, ſo much leſſe to another, that is onely of Apoſtolicall ordinance. For the Apoſtles might have given to ſome onely a power to abſolve, to ſome onely to conſecrate, to ſome onely to baptize. We ſee that to Deacons they did ſo. They had onely a power to baptize and preach, whether all Evangeliſts had ſo much or no, Scripture does not tell us.

* But if to ſome men they had onely given a power to uſe the Keyes, or made them officers ſpirituall to reſtore ſuch as are overtaken in a fault, and not to conſecrate the Euchariſt, (for we ſee theſe powers are diſtinct, and not relative and of neceſſary conjunction, no more then baptizing and conſecrating) whether or no had thoſe men who have only a power of abſolving or conſecrating reſpectively, whether (I ſay) have they the order of a

Presbyter?

Presbyter? If yea, then now every Preist hath two orders besides the order of Deacon, for by the power of Consecration he hath the power of a Presbyter, and what is he then by his other power? But if such a man ordayn'd with but one of these powers have not the order of a Presbyter, then let any man shew me where it is ordayned by Christ, or indeed by the Apostles, that an order of Clerks should be constituted with both these powers, and that these were called Presbyters. I only leave this to be considered.

* But all the Apostolicall power we find instituted by Christ, and we also find a necessity, that all that power should be succeeded in, and that all that power should be united in one order, for he that hath the highest, *viz.* a power of ordination, must needs have all the other, else he cannot give them to any else, but a power of ordination I have proved to be necessary and perpetuall.

So that, we have cleare evidence of the Divine institution of the perpetuall order of *Apostleship*, mary for the *Presbyterate* I have not so much either reason or confidence for it, as now it is in the Church; but for the Apostolate, it is beyond exception. And to this Bishops doe succeed. For that it is so, I have proved from Scripture, and because [*no Scirpture is of private interpretation*] I have attested it with the Catholike testimony of the Primitive Fathers, calling Episcopacy, the Apostolate, and Bishops successors of S. *Peter* in particular, and of all the Apostles in general in their ordi-

nary offices in which they were Superiour to the 72, the Antecessors of the Presbyterate.

One objection, I must cleare. For sometimes Presbyters are also called Apostles, and Successors of the Apostles, as in *Ignatius*, in *Irenæus*, in S. *Hierome*. I answer,

1. They are not called *Successores Apostolorum* by any *dogmaticall* resolution or interpretation of Scripture, as the Bishops are in the examples above alleaged; but by *allusion*, and participation at the most. For true it is that they succeed the Apostles in the offices of baptizing, consecrating, and absolving *in privato foro*, but this is but part of the Apostolicall power, and no part of their office as Apostles were superiour to Presbyters.

2. It is observeable that Presbyters are never affirmed to succeed in the power and regiment of the Church, but in subordination, and derivation from the Bishop, and therefore they are never said to succeed *in Cathedris Apostolorum*, in the Apostolick Sees.

3. The places which I have specifyed, and they are all I could ever meete with, are of peculiar answer. For as for *Ignatius* in his Epistle to the Church of *Trallis*, * he calls the Presbytery or company of Priests, the Colledge, or combination *of Apostles*. But here S. *Ignatius* as he lifts up the Presbyters to a comparison with Apostles, so he also raises the Bishop to the similitude and resemblance with God. *Episcopus typum Dei Patris omnium gerit, Presbyteri verò sunt conjunctus Apostolorum*

* *Idem ferè habet in Epist. ad* Magnes: *&* Smyrnens.

lorum cætus. So that although Presbyters grow high yet they doe not overtake the Bishops, or Apostles, who also in the same proportion grow higher then their first station. This then, will doe no hurt.

As for S. *Irenæus*, he indeed does say that Presbyters succeed the Apostles, but what Presbyters he means, he tells us, even such Presbyters as were also Bishops, such as S. *Peter* and S. *Iohn* was, who call themselves Presbyters, his words are these. *Propterea eis qui in Ecclesiâ sunt Presbyteris abaudire oportet his qui successionem habent ab Apostolis, qui cum Episcopatus successione charisma veritatis certum secundùm placitum Patris acceperunt.* And a little after, *Tales Presbyteros nutrit Ecclesia, de quibus & Propheta ait, & dabo Principes tuos in pace, & Episcopos tuos in Iustitiâ.* So that he gives testimony for us, not against us. As for S. *Hierome*, the third man, he in the succession to the honour of the Apostolate joynes Presbyters with Bishops, and that's right enough, for if the Bishop alone does succeed *in plenitudinem potestatis Apostolicæ ordinariæ*, as I have proved he does, then also it is as true of the Bishop together with his *consessus Presbyterorum. Episcopi & Presbyteri habeant in exemplum Apostolos & Apostolicos viros, quorum honorem possidentes, habere nitantur & meritum*, those are his words, and inforce not so much as may be safely granted, for *reddendo singula singulis*, Bishops succeed Apostles, and Presbyters Apostolick men, and such were many that had not at first any power Apostolicall

Lib. 4. c. 43.

Cap. 44.

Epist. 13.

licall, and that's all that can be inferred from this place of S. *Hierome*. I know nothing else to stay me, or to hinder our assent to those authorities of Scripture I have alleadged, and the full voyce of traditive interpretation.

§ 12. And the institution of Episcopacy as well as of the Apostolate expressed to be *Divine*, by primitive authority,

THE second argument from Antiquity is the direct testimony of the Fathers for a *Divine institution*. In this S. *Cyprian* is most plentifull. *Dominus noster* ** *Episcopi honorem & Ecclesiæ suæ rationem disponens in Evangelio, dicit Petro &c: Inde per temporum & successionum vices Episcoporum ordinatio & Ecclesiæ ratio decurrit, ut Ecclesia super Episcopos constituatur & omnis actus Ecclesiæ per eosdem Præpositos gubernetur. Cùm hoc itaq; Divinâ lege fundatum sit &c: Our Lord did institute in the Gospell the honour of a Bishop.* Hence comes the ordination of Bishops, and the Church is built upon them, and every action of the Church is to be governed by them, and this is founded upon a Divine law. *Meminisse autem Diaconi debent quoniam Apostolos*, i.e. *Episcopos, & præpositos Dominus elegit. Our Lord hath chosen Apostles, that is, Bishops and Church-governours.* And a little after. *Quod si nos aliquid audere contrà Deum possumus qui Episcopos facit, possunt & contra nos audere Diaconi, a quibus fiunt. We must not attempt any thing against God who hath instituted Bishops.* The same Father in his Epistle to *Magnus* disputes against *Novatianus* his being a Bishop. *Novatianus in Ecclesiâ non est, nec Episcopus computari potest, qui Evangelicâ &*

Epist. 27.

Epist. 65. *ad* Rogatian.

Epist. 76.

& Apostolicâ traditione contemptâ, nemini succedens à seipso ordinatus est. If there was both an Evangelicall, and an Apostolick tradition, for the successive ordination of Bishops, by other Bishops, (as S. *Cyprian* affirmes there is, by saying *Novatianus* contemned it,) then certainly the same Evangelicall power did institute that calling, for the *modus* of whose election, it took such particular order.

S. *Ignatius* long before him, speaking concerning his absent friend *Sotion* the Deacon, Ἔγνων ὀναίμην ὅτι ὑποτάσσεται τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ καὶ τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ χαίρει Θεῷ, ἐν νόμῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. He wishes for the good mans company, because *by the grace of God, and according to the law of Iesus Christ, he was obedient to the Bishop and his Clergy.* And a little after. πρέπον ἐστὶν ὑμᾶς ὑπακούειν τῷ Ἐπισκόπῳ ὑμῶν, καὶ κατὰ μηδὲν αὐτῷ ἀντιλέγειν. ἐ γὰρ τοῦτον ὃν βλέπομεν πλανᾷ τις, ἀλλὰ ὃν ἀόρατον παραλογίζεται· μὴ δυάμενον πρὸς πάνος παραλογισθῆναι. τὸ δὲ τοιοῦτο, ἐ πρὸς ἄνθρωπον ἀλλὰ πρὸς Θεὸν ἔχει τὴν ἀναφοράν. It is home enough. *Ye ought to obey your Bishop, and to contradict him in nothing.* It is a fearefull thing to contradict him: For *whosoever does so, does not mock a visible man, but the invisible, undeceiveable God. For this contumely relates not to man but to God.* So S. *Ignatius*, which could not be true, were it a humane constitution and no Divine ordinance. But more full are those words of his in his Epistle to the *Ephesians*, Σπουδάσατε ἀγαπητοὶ ὑποτάσσεσθαι τῷ Ἐπισκόπῳ, καὶ τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις, καὶ τοῖς διακόνοις. ὁ δὲ τούτοις ὑποτασσόμενος ὑπακούει Χριστῷ τῷ πεχειρισαμένῳ αὐτούς. *He that obeyes the Bishop and Clergy obeyes Christ, who did constitute*

Epist. ad Magnes.

tute

tute and ordaine them. This is plain and dogmaticall, I would be loath to have two men so famous, so Ancient, and so resolute, speake have so much against us.

Quæst. Vet. & N. Testam. qu. 97. But it is a generall resolve, and no private opinion. For S. *Austin* is confident in the case with a *Nemo ignorat Episcopos Salvatorem Ecclesiis instituisse. Ipse enim priusquam in cœlos ascenderet, imponens manum Apostolis, ordinavit eos Episcopos. No man is so ignorant but he knowes that our blessed Saviour appointed Bishops over Churches, for before his ascension into Heaven, he ordained the Apostles to be Bishops.* But long before him,

Euseb. lib. 4. c. 22. *Hegesippus* going to *Rome*, and by the way calling in at *Corinth*, and divers other Churches, discourſed with their severall Bishops, and found them Catholick and Holy, and then staid at *Rome* three successions of Bishops, *Anicetus*, *Soter*, and *Eleutherius*. *Sed in omnibus istis ordinationibus, vel in cæteris quas per reliquas urbes videram ita omnia habebantur, sicut lex antiquitùs tradidit, & Prophetæ indicaverunt*, Et Dominus Statuit. *All things in these ordinations or successions were as our Lord had appointed.* All things, therefore both of doctrine and discipline, and therefore the ordinations themselves too. Further yet, and it is worth observing, there was never any Bishop of *Rome* from S. *Peter* to S. *Sylvester*, that ever writ decretall Epistle now extant and transmitted to us, but either professedly or accidentally he said or intimated, *that the order of Bishops did come from God.*

S. *Ire-*

S. *Irenæus* speaking of Bishops successors to the Apostles, saith that with their order of Bishoprick, they have received *charisma veritatis certum, a true, and certaine or indelible character, secundùm placitum Patris, according to the will of God the Father.* And this also is the doctrine of S. *Ambrose, Ideò quanquam melior Apostolus aliquando tamen eget Prophetis, & quià ab uno Deo Patre sunt omnia, singulos Episcopos singulis Ecclesiis præesse decrevit. God from whom all good things doe come, did decree that every Church should be governed by a Bishop.* And againe, *Honor igitur, Fratres, & sublimitas Episcopalis, nullis poterit comparationibus adæquari; Si Regum fulgori compares &c:* and a little after, *Quid jam de plebeiâ dixerim multitudine, cui non solùm præferri à Domino meruit, sed ut eam quoq; jure tueatur patrio, præceptis imperatum est Evangelicis. The honour and sublimity of the Bishop is an incomparable prehemineence and is by God set over the people, and it is commanded by the precept of the holy Gospell that he should guide them by a Fathers right.* And in the close of his discourse, *Sic certè à Domino ad B. Petrum dicitur, Petre amas me? .... repetitum est à Domino tertio, Pasce oves meas. Quas oves, & quem gregem non solùm tunc B. suscepit Petrus, sed & cum illo nos suscepimus omnes. Our blessed Lord committed his sheep to S. Peter to be fed, and in him we* (who have Pastorall or Episcopall authority) *have received the same authority and commission.* Thus also divers of the Fathers speaking of the ordination of S. *Timothy* to be Bishop, and of S. *Paul's* intimation, that

Lib. 4. c. 43.

In 1. Corinth. 12.

De dignit. Sacerd. cap. 2.

it was by Prophecy, affirme it to be done by order of the Holy Ghost. τὶ ὄζιν ἀπὸ προφητείας; ἀπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου, saith S. *Chrysostome* *he was ordained by Prophecy, that is by the Holy Ghost.* ὁ θεὸς σὲ ἐξεκέξατο· ἐκ ἀνθρωπίνης γέγονας ἀρχῆς, *Thou wert not made Bishop by humane constitution.* πνεύματος προστάξει, saith *Oecumenius*, By Divine revelation, saith *Theodoret*. By the command of the Holy Ghost, so *Theophylact*; and indeed so S. *Paul*, to the assembly of Elders and Bishops met at *Miletus*, *Spiritus S. posuit vos Episcopos, the Holy Ghost hath made you Bishops*: & to be sure S. *Timothy* was amongst them, and he was a Bishop, and so were diverse others there present; therefore the order it selfe is a ray streaming from the Divine beauty, since a single person was made Bishop by revelation. I might multiply authorities in this particular, which are very frequent and confident for the *Divine institution* of Episcopacy, in † *Origen*, in the Councell of *Carthage* recorded by S. *Cyprian*, in the collection of the * Oriental Canons by *Martinus Bracarensis*: in the Councells of [a] *Aquisgrane*, and [b] *Toledo*, and many more. The summe is that which was taught by [c] S. *Sixtus*, *Apostolorum dispositione, ordinante Domino Episcopi primùm sunt constituti. The Lord did at first ordaine, and the Apostles did so order it, and so Bishops at first had their Originall constitution.*

Homil. 4. Græc. 5. lat. in 1. Tim. 1. cap.

In 1. Tit.

Acts 20.

† *Hom. 32. in Iohan.*

* *Can. 6.*

a *c. 25.*
b *Octauum can. 7.*
c *Epist. 2.*

These and all the former who affirme Bishops to be successors of the Apostles, & by consequence to have the same institution, drive all to the same issue, and are sufficient to make faith, that it was the doctrine

doctrine Primitive, and Catholick that Episcopacy is a divine institution, which *Christ Planted* in the first founding of Christendome, which the Holy Ghost *Watered* in his first descent on Pentecost, and to which we are confident that *God will give an increase* by a never failing succession, unlesse where God removes the Candlestick, or which is all one, takes away the starre, the Angell of light from it, that it may be invelop'd in darknesse, *usq; ad consummationem sæculi & aperturam tenebrarum.* The conclusion of all, I subjoyne in the words of Venerable *Bede* before quoted, *sunt ergo jure Divino Episcopi à Presbyteris prælatione distincti. Bishops are distinct from Presbyters, and Superiour to them by the law of God.*

Lib. 3. in Lucam. c. 15.

THE second *Basis* of Episcopacy is *Apostolicall tradition.* We have seen what Christ did, now wee shall see what was done by his Apostles. And since they knew their Masters mind so well, wee can never better confide in any argument to prove *Divine institution* of a derivative authority then the practise Apostolicall. *Apostoli enim Discipuli veritatis existentes, extra omne mendacium sunt, non enim communicat mendacium veritati, sicut non communicant tenebræ luci, sed præsentia alterius excludit alterum.* saith S. *Irenæus.*

Lib. 3. cap. 5.

§ 13. In pursuance of the *Divine institution,* the Apostles did ordaine Bishops in severall Churches,

FIrst, then, the Apostles did presently after the ascension fixe an Apostle or a Bishop in the chayre of *Ierusalem.* For they knew that *Ierusalem* was shortly to be destroyed, they themselves foretold of miseryes and desolations to ensue, (*Petrus & Paulus prædicunt cladem Hierosolymitanam,* saith *Lactan-*

Lactantius l. 4. inst.) famines and warres, and not a stone left upon another was the fate of that Rebellious City by Christs owne prediction, which themselves recorded in Scripture. And to say they understood not what they writ, is to make them *Enthusiasts*, and neither good Doctors nor wise seers. But it is ἔξω βέλος that the holy Spirit which was promised *to lead them into all truth* would instruct them in so concerning an issue of publike affaires, as was so Great desolation, and therefore they began betimes to establish that Church, and to fixe it upon it's perpetuall base. 2ly The Church of *Ierusalem* was to be the president and platforme for other Churches. [*The word of God went forth into all the world, beginning first at Ierusalem*], and therefore also it was more necessary a Bishop should be there plac'd betimes, that other Churches might see their governement from whence they receiv'd their doctrine, that they might see from what starres their continuall fluxe of light must streame. 3ly The Apostles were actually dispers'd by persecution, and this to be sure they look'd for, and therefore (so implying the necessity of a Bishop to governe in their absence or decession any wayes) they ordayn'd S. *Iames* the first Bishop of *Ierusalem*; there he fixt his chayre, there he liv'd Bishop for 30 yeares, and finish'd his course with glorious Martyrdome. If this be proov'd we are in a fayre way for practise Apostolicall. As S. *Iames* at Hierusalem.

First, let us see all that is said of S. *Iames* in Scripture, that may concerne this affayre. *Acts.* 15. We

find S. *Iames* in the *Synod* at *Ierusalem*, not disputing, but giving finall determination to that Great Qu: about *Circumcision*. [*And when there had beene much disputing, Peter rose up and said* &c:] He first drave the question to an issue, and told them what he beleiv'd concerning it, with a πιστεύομεν σωθῆναι, we trust it will goe as well with us without circumcision, as with our Forefathers who us'd it. But S. *Iames* when he had summ'd up what had beene said by S. *Peter*, gave sentence and finall determination. Διὸ ἐγὼ κρίνω. *wherefore I judge or give sentence.* So he. The Acts of Councell which the Brethren or Presbyters did use were *deliberative, they disputed, v.*7. S. *Peter's* act was *declarative*, but S. *Iames* his was *decisive*; which proves him clearely (if by reasonablenesse of the thing and the successive practise of Christendome in imitation of this first Councell Apostolicall we may take our estimate) that S. *Iames* was the President of this Synod, which considering that he was none of the twelve (as I proved formerly) is unimaginable, were it not for the advantage of the place, it being held in *Ierusalem*, where he was *Hierosolymorum Episcopus* (as S. *Clement* call's him) especially in the presence of S. *Peter*, who was *primus Apostolus*, and decked with many personall priviledges and prerogatives.

* Adde to this, that although the whole Councell did consent to the sending of the Decretall Epistle, and to send *Iudas* and *Silas*, yet because they were of the Presbytery, and Colledge of *Ierusalem*, S. *Iames* his Clergy, they are said, as by way of appropriation

propriation to come from S. *Iames*. *Gal.* 2. *v.* 12. Upon which place S. *Austin* saith thus, *Cùm vidisset quosdam venisse à Iacobo, i. e. à Iudæâ, nam Ecclesiæ Hierosolymitanæ Iacobus præfuit.* To this purpose that of *Ignatius* is very pertinent calling S. *Stephen* the Deacon of S. *Iames*, and in his Epistle to *Hero*, saying that he did Minister to S. *Iames* and the Presbyters of *Ieruſalem*, which if we expound according to the knowne discipline of the Church in *Ignatius* time (who was *Suppar Apostolorum*, onely not a contemporary Bishop) here is plainely the eminency of an Episcopall chayre, and *Ieruſalem* the seat of S. *Iames*, and the Clergy his owne, of a Colledge of which he was the *præpositus Ordinarius*, he was their *Ordinary*. *Epist. ad Trall.*

* The second evidence of Scripture is [Acts. 21. *And when we were come to Ieruſalem the Brethren received us gladly, and the day following Paul went in with us unto Iames, and all the Elders were present.*] Why unto *Iames*? Why not rather into the Presbytery, or Colledge of Elders, if *Iames* did not *eminere*, were not the ἡγούμενος, the *Præpositus* or *Bishop* of them all?

Now that these conjectures are not vayne and impertinent, see it testified by Antiquity, to which in matter of fact, and Church-story, he that will not give faith upon concurrent testimonies, and uncontradicted by Antiquity is a mad man, and may as well disbeleive every thing that he hath not seene himselfe, and can no way prove that himselfe was Christned, and to be sure, after 1600 yeares there is

no

no possibility to disprove a matter of fact that was never question'd or doubted of before, and therefore can never obtayne the faith of any man to his contradictory, it being impossible to prove it.

lib. 2. hist. cap. 1. *Eusebius* reports out of S. *Clement.* Πέτρον γὰρ φάσι καὶ Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην μὴ τιμὰ ἀναλαμψιν τῆς σωτηρος ἐὰν ὑπὸ τῆς Κυρίε τεθηπιμηκέναι, μὴ ἐπιδιηκζεῖν δόξης, ἀλλ' Ἰάκωβον τὸν δικαιον ἐπίσκοπον Ἱερουσαλὴμων ἑλέσθαι. S. *Peter and* S. *John although they were honoured of our Lord, yet they would not themselves be, but made Iames sirnamed the Iust, Bishop of Ierusalem*; And the reason is that which is given by *Hegesippus* in *Eusebius* for his successor *Simeon Cleophæ*, for when S. *Iames* was crown'd with Martyrdome, and immediately the

lib. 3. c. 11. City destroyed, *Traditur Apostolos qui supererant in commune consilium habuisse quem oportere dignum* SUCCESSIONE IACOBI *judicari*. It was concluded for *Simeon*, because he was the Kinsman of our Lord as S. *Iames* also his Predecessor. The same concerning S. *Iames* is also repeated by *Eusebius*. *Iudæi ergo cùm Paulus provocasset ad Cæsarem..... In*

lib. 2. c. 22. *Iacobum fratrem Domini* CUI AB APOSTOLIS SEDES HIEROSOLYMITANA DELATA FUIT, *omnem suam malevolentiam convertunt.*

lib. 7. c. 46. & lib. 8. cap. ult: In the Apostolicall constitutions under the name of S. *Clement* the Apostles are brought in speaking thus. *De ordinatis autem à nobis Episcopis in vitâ nostrâ, significamus vobis quòd hi sunt; Hierosolymis ordinatus est Iacobus Frater Domini.* S. *Iames the Brother of our Lord was ordayned Bishop of Ierusalem by us* [Apostles.] The same is witnessed by *Anacletus.*

cletus. Porrò & Hierosolymitarum primus Episcopus Epist. 2.
B. Iacobus qui Iustus dicebatur, & secundùm carnem Domini nuncupatus est frater, à Petro, Iacobo, & Iohanne Apostolis est ordinatus. And the same thing in termes is repeated by *Anicetus*, with a *Scimus enim* *Epist. decret. Unic:*
Beatissimum Iacobum &c: Iust as *Anacletus* before. S. *Iames* was Bishop of *Ierusalem*, and *Peter*, *Iames*, and *Iohn* were his Ordayners.

But let us see the testimony of one of S. *Iames* his Successors in the same Chayre, who certainly was the best witnesse of his owne Church Records. S. *Cyrill* of *Ierusalem* is the man. *Nam de his non mihi* *Catech. 4.*
solùm, sed etiam Apostolis, & IACOBO HUIVS ECCLESIÆ OLIM EPISCOPO *curæ fuit*, speaking of the question of circumcision, and things sacrificed to Idols, and againe, he calls S. *Iames*, *primum hujus parochiæ Episcopum*, the first Bishop of this Diocesse. *Catech. 16.*

S. *Austin* also attests this story. *Cathedra tibi quid* *lib: 2. cont lit: Petil: c. 51. & lib: 2. cont: Cresc: c. 37.*
fecit Ecclesiæ Romanæ, in quâ Petrus sedit, & in quâ hodiè Anastasius sedet? Vel Ecclesiæ Hierosolymitanæ IN QVA IACOBUS SEDIT, *& in quâ hodiè Iohannes sedet?* I must not omitt the testimony of S. *Ierome*, *lib: de Script. Eccles: in Iacobo.*
for it will be of great use in the sequel, *Iacobus* (saith he) *post passionem Domini statim ab Apostolis Hierosolymorum Episcopus ordinatus*, and the same also he repeates out of *Hegesippus*. * There are many more testimonyes to this purpose, as of S.[a] *Chrysostome*, [b] *Epiphanius*, S. [c] *Ambrose*, the Councell of [d] *Constantinople in Trullo*. But *Gregorius Turonensis* rises a little higher, *Iacobus Frater Domini* *vocitatus, ab ipso Domino nostro Iesu Christo Episco-*

[a] *homil: 38. in 1. Cor. 15. & 33. hom: in 15. Act.* [b] *hæres. 66.* [c] *in 1. Galat.* [d] *cap. 33.*

pus dicitur ordinatus. S. Iames the Brother of our Lord is said to have beene ordain'd Bishop by our Lord Iesus Christ himselfe. If by [*Ordinatus*] he meanes [*designatus*] he agrees with S. *Chrysostome*: But either of them both will serve the turne for the present. But either in one sense or the other it is true, and attested also by *Epiphanius*, *& primus hic accepit Cathedram Episcopatûs, cui concredidit Dominus thronum suum in terrâ primò. S. Iames had first the Episcopall chayre, for our Lord first intrusted his earthly throne to him.* And thus we are incircled with a cloud of witnesses, to all which if we adde what I before observed, that S. *Iames* is in Scripture called an Apostle, and yet he was none of the twelve, and that in the sense of Scripture and the Catholike Church, a Bishop and an Apostle is all one, it followes from the premises, (and of them already there is faith enough made) that S. *Iames* was by Christs owne designation, and ordination Apostolicall made Bishop of the Church of *Ierusalem*, that is, had power Apostolicall concredited to him which Presbyters had not, and this Apostolate was limited and fixed, as his Successors since have beene.

homil. 3. in Act.

haeres. 78.

But that this also was not a temporary businesse, and to expire with the persons of S. *Iames* and the first Apostles, but a regiment of ordinary and successive duty in the Church, it appeares by the ordination of S. *Simeon* the sonne of *Cleophas* to be his Successor. It is witnessed by *Eusebius*, *Post martyrium Iacobi .... traditur Apostolos &c. habuisse in commune Concilium quem oporteret dignum successione*

S. Simeon to be his successor,

lib. 3. hist. cap. 11.

Iacobi

Iacobi judicari; omnesq; uno consilio, atq; uno consensu Simeonem Cleophæ filium decrevisse ut Episcopatûs sedem susciperet. The same also he transcribes out of *Hegesippus*, *Posteaquam Iacobus Martyr effectus est* lib 4. cap. 22. *.... electione divinâ Simeon Cleophæ filius Episcopus ordinatur, electus ab omnibus pro eo quòd esset consobrinus Domini.* S. *Simeon* was ordayn'd Bishop *by a Divine election*; And *Epiphanius* in the Catalogue of the Bishops of *Ierusalem*, reckons first *Iames*, and next *Simeon*, *qui sub Trajano crucifixus est.* hæres. 66.

§ 14.

THe next Bishop we find ordayn'd by the Apostles was *Timothy* at *Ephesus*. That he was ordayn'd by an Apostle appeares in Scripture. For S. *Paul* impos'd hands on him, that's certayne, *Excita Gratiam quæ in te est per impositionem manuum mearum*, *by the laying on of* My Hands. That he was there a Bishop is also apparent, from the power and offices concredited to him. 1. He was to be * resident at *Ephesus*. And although for the publike necessityes of the Church, and for assistance to S. *Paul* he might be called sometimes from his Charge, yet there he liv'd and dyed as the Church story writes, there was his ordinary residence, and his avocations were but temporary and occasionall, and when it was, his Cure was supplyed by *Tychicus*, whom S. *Paul* sent to *Ephesus* as his Vicar, as I shall shew hereafter.

S. *Timothy* at *Ephesus*.

2. Tim. 1. 6.

* 1. Tim. 1. 3.

2. S. *Paul* in his epistles to him, gave directions to him for *Episcopall deportment* as is plaine. *A Bishop must be blamelesse, the husband of one wife, &c.* 1. Tim. 3.

3. S. *Paul* concredits jurisdiction to S. *Timothy*. Over the people; παράγγειλε ταῦτα καὶ δίδασκε. παραγγέλειν is of as great extent in S. *Timothies* commission as διδάσκειν. *Commanding* as *teaching*. Over Presbyters; but yet so as to make difference between them and the *Neotericks* in Christianity, *the one as Fathers, the other as Brethren.* ἐπίπληξις is denied to be used towards either of them. ἐπίπληξις, ὄνειδισμος saith *Suidas*, a dishonourable upbraiding or objurgation. Nay it is more; ἐπιπλήττω is *castigo, plagam infero*, saith *Budæus*: so that, *that kind* of Rebuking the Bishop is forbidden to use, either toward Priest or Deacon, Clergy or Laity, Old or Young. [*for a Bishop must be no striker.*] but παρακάλει, that's given him in commission both to old and young, Presbyters and Catechumens, that is, *Require them; postula, provoca.* παρακεκλῆσθαι εἰς συμμαχίαν. *Synesius. To be provoked to a Duel, to be challenged.* and προκαλῶ ὑμᾶς εἰς παρακλῆσιν. *Chrysostome. Ad precandum vos provoco.* προκαλεῖς με εἰς δάκρυα. *Eurip. Thou makest me, or compellest me to shed teares. Suavitèr omnia.* That's the way S. *Paul* takes. *Meekely*; but yet so as to doe his office, to keep all in their severall duties, and that is by a παράγγειλε ταῦτα, *command these things*, for so he summes up the Bishops duty towards Presbyters, Neophytes, and Widdowes. 1. Tim. 5. 7. *Give all these things in charge.* Command all to doe their duty. *Command*, but not *objurgate. Et quid negotii esset Episcopo ut Presbyterum non objurgaret si super Presbyterum non haberet potestatem.* So *Epiphanius* urges this argument to advantage. For indeed,

1 Tim. 5. 1.

hæres. 75.

deed it had been to little purpose for S. *Paul* to have given order to *Timothy*, how he should exercise his jurisdiction over Presbyters and people, if he had had no jurisdiction and coercitive authority at all. Nay, and howsoever S. *Paul* forbids to *Timothy* to use ἐπίπληξις, which is ἐπιτίμησις, yet S. *Paul* in his second Epistle bids him use it, intimating, upon great occasion. ἔλεγξον, ἐπιτίμησον, παρακάλεσον. To be sure παράκλησις, if it be but an *urging*, or an *exhortation*, is not all, for S. *Paul* gives him *coercitive* jurisdiction, as well as *directive*. Over Widdowes. νεωτέρας χήρας παραιτοῦ. *Reject the younger Widdowes, viz. à collegio viduarum, ab eleemosynis Ecclesiæ.* Over Presbyters. for he commands him to have sufficient probate in the accusation of Presbyters, of which if he was not to take cognisance, it was to no purpose to number witnesses. Κατὰ πρεσβυτέρου κατηγορίαν μὴ παραδέχου. *Receive not a publick accusation* [*in foro externo*] *against a Priest, Non vocabis in jus nisi in testimonio duorum, &c.* to wit, in causes *criminall*. That is sufficient intimation of the Bishops power To Take Cognisance in causes criminall; then for his *punishing* in such causes, it followes in the next words, τὰς ἁμαρτάνοντας ἐνώπιον πάντων ἔλεγχε. *Reprehend them publikely*, that is, disgrace them. For ἐλεγχὴς is ἐπονείδιστος, *inaccorus*. .... Ἀργεῖοι ὀμωῇ, ἐλεγχέες, ἠνυσάμεθα. *Homer Iliad. γ.* So that ἐνώπιον πάντων ἔλεγχε in S. *Paul*, is *to call them to publick account*; that's one part of the jurisdiction. ἔλεγχον τοῦτο λαλεῖν, is to examine. *Plato Epist.* ὀδόμαι ἔλεγχον τοῦ βίου, to give an account of one's life. *idem in Apolog.* And

2. Tim. 4. 2.

1. Tim. 5. 20.

then also it implies punishment upon conviction,

Ἀτρεΐδη, νῦν δή σε ἄναξ, ἐξέλυσιν Ἀχαιοὶ
Πᾶσιν ἐλέγχιστον δυμῶναι μερόπεσσι βροτοῖσι. *Hom. Il. Iliad.*

But the words in S. *Paul* will cleare this businesse. *Let them that sinne be publikly sham'd*, ἵνα καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ φόβον ἔχωσι, *that the rest may feare*; A punishment most certainly, something that is ἐν φύσει τῶν φοβερῶν, *Malum in genere pœnæ*. What else should they feare? to sinne? Most true. But why upon this reprehension, if not for feare of being punished?

Adde to all this, that here is in this chapter the plaine giving of a jurisdiction, an erection of a judicatory, and is all the way, direction for his proceeding in causes criminall, appears most evidently, *v.* 21. *I charge thee before God and the Lord Iesus Christ and the elect Angells, that thou observe these things*, χωρὶς προκρίματος, *without prejudging* the cause of any mã before it comes in open contestatiõ under publick test of witnesses, μηδὲν ποιῶν κατὰ πρόσκλισιν, *doing nothing for favour or partiality*. Nothing in the world is plainer for the erection of a *Consistory* then these mandates of S. *Paul*.

Lastly, to make up his Episcopall function compleat S. *Paul* gives him also direction concerning giving of orders. [*Lay hands suddenly on no man.*] *sub testatione ergo ea quæ ad ordinationem Ecclesiæ mandat custodiri .... Ne facilè aliquis accipiat Ecclesiasticam dignitatem .... peccat enim si non probat & sic ordinet. Melior enim cæteris debet probari qui ordinandus est. Hæc Episcopus custodiens, castum se exhibebit religioni, cujus rei in futuro præmium consequetur.*

Vers. 22.

So

So S. *Ambrose* upon the place, who is so farre from exempting Presbyters from being submitted to the Bishops consistory, that he does appropriate all his former cautions concerning the judicature, and coercitive jurisdiction to causes of the Clergy.

Adde to this evidence of Scripture the testimony of Catholike and unquestion'd Antiquity affirming S. *Timothy* to have beene ordain'd Bishop of *Ephesus* by S. *Paul*. *Eusebius* speaking of the successions to S. *Paul*, *sed & Lucas* (saith he) *in actibus Apostolorum plurimos ejus socios memorat, sicut Timothei & Titi, quorum alter in Epheſi Episcopus ... ab eo ordinatus præficitur.* S. *Ambrose* affirmes that S. *Paul* having ordained him Bishop writes his first Epistle to him to instruct him in his Episcopall office. *Hunc igitur jam creatum Episcopum instruit per Epistolam quomodo deberet Ecclesiam ordinare.* And that this Epistle was written to instruct S. *Timothy* for his owne person, and all Bishops in him for their deportment in the office of a Bishop is the united, concurrent testimony of S. [a] *Vincentius*, [b] *Tertullian*, S. [c] *Chrysostome*, S. [d] *Ambrose*, [e] *Oecumenius*, [f] *Epiphanius*, [g] *Primasius*, and S. [h] *Gregory*. As for *Epiphanius* in the place now quoted he uses it as an argument against the madnesse and stupidity of *Aërius* contending a Bishop and a Presbyter to be all one; *docet Divinus Apostoli sermo quis sit Episcopus & quis Presbyter quum dicit ad Timotheum qui erat Episcopus, Presbyterum ne objurges, &c.* I shall transcribe no more testimonies for this particular but that of the generall Councell of *Chalcedon* in the

Lib. 3. c. 4.

Præfat. in 1. Tim.

a *Contr. hæres.*
b *contr. Marcion. l.* 5.
c *hom.* 10 *in* 1. Timoth.
d *in* 5. *cap. in* 1. Tim.
e *in* 1. Tim. 4. *c. &* 5. *c.*
f *hæres.* 75.
g *ad* Timoth. *cap.* 4.
h *in Pastor. part.* 2. *c.* 11.

Acts. 11.

the case of *Bassianus* and *Stephanus*; *Leontius* the Bishop of *Magnesia* spake it in full Councell, ἀπὸ τῦ ἁγίε Τιμοθέε μέχει νυῦ εἴκοσι ἑπτὰ ἐπίσκοποι ἐχίροτο, πάντες ἐν ἐφέσῳ ἐχειροτονήθησαν. *From S. Timothy untill now there have beene 27 Bishops ordayned in Ephesus.* Who desires a multitude of testimonies (though enough already have deposed in the cause, beside the evidence of Scripture) may to these adde that saying of S. *Chrysostome*, that to *Timothy* was committed ἔθνος ὁλόκληρον τῦτο Ἀσίας; of *Theodoret*, calling him *Episcopum Asianorum*; the subscription to the first Epistle to *Timothy*, (which if it were not writ by S. *Paul*, yet at least, will prove a primitive record, and very Ancient,) the fragment of the Martyrdome of S. *Timothy* in *Photius*, [i] S. *Ierome*, [k] *Theophylact*, [l] *Isidore*, and [m] *Nicephorus*.

In Titum. & 1. Philip. *In* 1. Tim. 3.

Biblioth: Photij. n. 254.

i *De script. Eccles.*

k *In præfat. in* 1. Timoth.

l *De vitâ & morte SS.* 87, & 88.

m *Lib.* 2. *c.* 34.

And now all is well if after all this Timothy doe not prove an *Evangelist*, for this one objection will be sufficient to catch at to support a drowning cause, and though neither pertinent nor true, yet shall be laid in the ballance against all the evidence of Scripture and Catholick antiquity. But [*doe the work of an Evangelist*] (saith S. *Paul*) therefore it is cleare S. *Timothy* was no Bishop. No, was not? That's hard. But let us try however.

2. Τλὼ διακονίαν συ πληροφόρησον, those are the next words, *fulfill thy Deaconship*. And therefore he was no Bishop? As well this as the other, for if *Deaconship* doe not exclude *Episcopacy*, why shall his being an *Evangelist* exclude it? Or why may not his being a *Deacon* exclude his being an *Evangelist*, as well

2. Tim. 4. 5.

well as his being an *Evangelist*, exclude his being a *Bishop?* Whether is higher, a Bishoprick, or the office of an Evangelist? If a Bishops office be higher, and therefore cannot consist with an Evangelist, then a Bishop cannot be a Priest, and a Priest cannot be a Deacon, and an Evangelist can be neither, for that also is thought to be higher then them both. But if the office of an Evangelist be higher, then as long as they are not disparate, much lesse destructive of each other, they may have leave to consist in subordination. For as for the pretence that an Evangelist is an office of a *moveable imployment*, and a Bishoprick of *fixt residence*, that will be considered by and by.

2. All the former discourse is upon supposition, that the word διακονία, implyes the *office of a Deacon*, and so it may as well as S. *Pauls* other phrase implyes S. *Timothy* to be an *Evangelist*. For if we marke it well it is ἔργον ποίησον Εὐαγγελιστοῦ, doe *the worke*, not *the office* of an Evangelist. And what's that? We may see it in the verses immediatly going before, Κήρυξον τὸν λόγον ἐπίσηθι εὐκαίρως, ἀκαίρως, ἔλεγξον, ἐπίτίμησον, παρακάλεσον ἐν πάσῃ μακροθυμίᾳ καὶ διδαχῇ. And if this be the work of an Evangelist which S. *Paul* would have *Timothy* performe, *viz.* to preach, to be instant in season, and out of season, to reprove, to rebuke, to exhort, there is no harme done, a Bishop may, nay he must doe all this.

3. Consider we what an *Evangelist* is, and thence take our estimate for the present. 1. He that writes the story of the Gospell is an *Evangelist*, so

the Greek Scholiast calls him. And in this sense indeed S. *Timothy* was not an Evangelist, but yet if he had, he might have been a Bishop, because S. *Mark* was an Evangelist to be sure, and perhaps as sure that he was a Bishop; sure enough; for they are both delivered to us by the Catholick testimony of the Primitive Church, as we shall see hereafter, so farre as concernes our Question. But then again, an Apostle might be an Evangelist, S. *Matthew* was, and S. *Iohn* was, and the Apostolicall dignity is as much inconsistent with the office of an Evangelist, as Episcopall preheminence, for I have proved these two names *Apostle* and *Bishop* to signify all one thing. 2. S. *Ambrose* gives another exposition of [*Evangelists.*] *Evangelistæ Diaconi sunt sicut fuit Philippus.* S. *Philip* was one of the seaven, commonly called *Deacons*, and he was also a *Presbyter*, and yet an *Evangelist*, and yet a Presbyter in it's proportion is an office of as necessary residence as a Bishop, or else why are Presbyters cry'd out against so bitterly in all cases, for *non-residence*, and yet nothing hinders, but that S. *Timothy*, as well as S. *Philip*, might have been a Presbyter and an Evangelist together, and then why not a Bishop too, for why should a Deaconship, or a Presbyterate consist with the office of an Evangelist, more then a Bishoprick? 3. Another acceptation of [*Evangelist*] is also in *Eusebius. Sed & alii plurimi per idem tempus Apostolorum Discipuli superstites erant.... Nonnulli ex his ardentiores Divinæ Philosophiæ.... animas suas verbo Dei consecrabant .... ut si quibus forte*

In 4. Ephes.

Lib. 3. hist. cap. 37.

fortè provinciis nomen fidei esset incognitum prædicarent, primáq; apud eos Evangelii fundamenta collocantes .... Evangelistarum fungebantur officio. They that planted the Gospell first in any Country, they were Evangelists. S. *Timothy* might be such a one, and yet be a Bishop afterwards. And so were some of this sort of Evangelists. For so *Eusebius*, *Primáq; apud eos fundamenta Evangelii collocantes, atq; Electis Quibusque Ex Ipsis officium regendæ Ecclesiæ quam fundaverant committentes, ipsi rursùm ad alias gentes properabant.* So that they first converted the Nation, and then gouern'd the Church, first they were Evangelists and afterwards Bishops; and so was *Austin* the Monke that converted *England* in the time of S. *Gregory* and *Ethelbert*, he was first our Evangelist, and afterwards Bishop of *Dover*. Nay why may they not in this sence be both Evangelists and Bishops at the same time, insomuch as many Bishops have first planted Christianity in divers Countries, as S. *Chrysostome* in *Scythia*, S. *Trophimus*, S. *Denis*, S. *Marke*, and many more. By the way only, according to all these acceptations of the word [*Evangelist*] this office does not imply a perpetuall motion. Evangelists many of them did travell, but they were never the more Evangelists for that, but only their office was writing or preaching the Gospell, and thence they had their name.

Lib. 10. tri. part. hist. cap. 5. Theodoret.

4. The office of an Evangelist was but *temporary*, and take it in either of the two senses of *Eusebius* or *Oecumenius*, which are the only true and

genuine, was to expire when Christianity was planted every where, and the office of Episcopacy, if it was at all was to be succeeded in, and therefore in no respect could these be inconsistent, at least, not alwaies. * And how S. *Paul* should intend that *Timothy* should keep those rules he gave him, [*to the comming of our Lord Iesus Christ*,] if the office for the execution of which he gave him the rules, was to expire long before, is not so easily imagined. For if S. *Paul* did direct him in a temporary and expiring office, then in no sense, neither in person, nor in succession could those rules of S. *Paul* be kept till Christs coming, to wit, to judgement. But if he instructed *him* in the perpetuall office of Episcopacy, then it is eaſy to understand that S. *Paul* gave that caution to *Timothy*, to intimate that those his directions were *not personall*, but for his successors in that charge, to which he had ordained him, *viz.* in the sacred order and office of Episcopacy.

1. Tim. 6. 14.

5. Lastly, After all this stirre, there are some of the Fathers, that will by no means admit S. *Timothy* to have been an Evangelist. So S. *Chrysostome*, so *Theophylact*, so the Greek Scholiast, now though we have no need to make any use of it yet if it be true, it makes all this discourse needlesse, we were safe enough without it, if it be false, then it selfe we see is needlesse, for the allegation of S. *Timothy's* being an Evangelist, is absolutely impertinent, though it had been true.

In Ephes. 4.

But

But now I proceed.

§ 15. S. Titus at Crete.

Titus was also made a Bishop by the Apostles. S. *Paul* also was his ordainer. 1. *Reliqui te Cretæ.* There S. *Paul* fixt his seat for him, at *Crete.* 2. His worke was τὰ λείποντα ἐπιδιορθώσαι, *to set in order things that are wanting, viz.* to constitute rites and formes of publike Liturgy, to erect a Consistory for cognisance of causes criminall, to dedicate houses for prayer by publick destination for divine Service, and in a word, by his authority to establish such Discipline and Ritualls, as himselfe did judge to be most for edification and ornament of the Church of God. For he that was appointed by S. *Paul,* to rectify, and set things in order, was most certainly by him supposed to be the Iudge of all the obliquities which he was to rectify. 2. The next worke is Episcopall too, and it is the *ordaining Presbyters in every Citty.* Not Presbyters *collectively* in every Citty, but *distributively,* κατὰ πόλιν, Citty by Citty, that is Elders in severall Cities, one in one Citty, Many in many. For by these Elders are certainly meant Bishops. Of the identity of Names I shall afterwards give an account, but here it is plaine S. *Paul* expounds himselfe to meane Bishops.

1. In termes and expresse words. [*To ordaine Elders in every Citty; If any be the husband of one wife, &c. For a Bishop must be blameleße.*] That is, the elders that you are to ordaine in severall Citties must be blameleße, for else they must not be Bishops. 2. The word πρεσβυτέρες cannot hinder this

expoſition, for S. *Peter* calls himſelfe ὁ συμπρεσβύτερος, and S. *Iohn, Presbyter electæ Dominæ*, and *Presbyter dilectiſsimo Gajo*. Such Presbyters as theſe were Apoſtolicall, and that's as much as Epiſcopall to be ſure. 3. S. *Paul* addes farther [*a Biſhop muſt be blameleſſe* As The Steward Of God. *Who then is that faithfull and wiſe Steward, whom his Lord ſhall make ruler?*] S. *Pauls* Biſhop is Gods ſteward, and Gods ſteward is the ruler of his houſe-hold, ſaies our bleſſed Saviour himſelfe, and therefore not a meere Presbyter, amongſt whom indeed there is a parity, but no ſuperintendency of Gods making. 4. S. *Paul* does in the ſequell ſtill qualify his Elders or Biſhops with more proprieties of rulers. *A Biſhop muſt be no ſtriker, not given to wine.* They are exactly the requiſites which our bleſſed Saviour exacts in his Stewards or Rulers accounts. [*If the Steward of the houſe will drinke and be* Drunke, *and* Beate *his fellow ſervants, then the Lord of that ſervant ſhall come and divide him his portion with unbelievers.*] The ſteward of the houſhold, this Ruler, muſt not be πάροινος, nor πλήκτης, no more muſt a Biſhop, he muſt not be *given to wine, no ſtriker; Neq; enim pugilem deſcribit ſermo Apoſtolicus, ſed Pontificem inſtituit quid facere non debeat*, ſaith S. *Hierome:* ſtill then, theſe are the Rulers of the Church, which S. *Titus* was to ordaine, and therefore it is required ſhould Rule well his own houſe, for how elſe ſhall hee take charge of the Church of God, implying that this his charge is to Rule the houſe of God. 5. The reaſon why

Titus. 1.

Adverſ: Iouinian.

S. *Paul*

S. *Paul* appointed him to ordaine these Bishops in Cities is in order to coercitive jurisdiction, because [*many unruly and vaine talkers were crept in, vers.* 10.] and they were to be silenced ὃς δεῖ ἐπιστομίζειν. *Their mouths must be stopped.* Therefore they must be such Elders as had superiority of jurisdiction over these impertinent Preachers, which to a *single* Presbyter, either by Divine or Apostolicall institution no man will grant, and to a *Colledge* of Presbyters S. *Paul* does not intend it, for himselfe had given it singly to *S. Titus*. For I consider,

Titus alone had coercitive jurisdiction before he ordayn'd these Elders, be they Bishops, be they Presbyters. The Presbyters which were at *Crete* before his comming had not Episcopall power, or coercitive jurisdiction, for why then was *Titus* sent? As for the Presbyters which *Titus* ordayn'd, before his ordayning them, to be sure they had no power at all, they were not Presbyters. If they had a coercitiv jurisdiction afterwards, to wit, by their ordination, then *Titus* had it before in his owne person, (for they that were there before his comming had not, as I shewed) and therefore he must also have it still, for he could not loose it by ordaining others, or if he had it not before, how could he give it unto them whom he ordain'd? For *plus juris in alium transferre nemo potest, quàm ipse habet.*

Howsoever it be then, to be sure, *Titus* had it in his owne person and then it follows Undeniably, that either this coercitive jurisdiction was not necessary for the Church (which would be either to suppose

suppose men impeccable, or the Church to be exposed to all the inconveniences of Schisme and tumultuary factions without possibility of releife) or if it was necessary, then because it was in *Titus* not as a personall prerogative, but a power to be succeeded to; he might ordaine others, he had authority to doe it, with the same power he had himselfe, and therefore since he alone had this coercion in his owne person, so should his Successors, and then because a single Presbyter, could not have it over his brethren by the confession of all sides, nor the Colledge of Presbyters which were there before his comming had it not, for why then was *Titus* sent with a new commission, nor those which he was to ordaine if they were but meere Presbyters could not have it, no more then the Presbytes that were there before his comming, it followes that those Elders which S. *Paul* sent *Titus* to ordaine being such as were to be constituted in opposition and power over the false Doctors and prating Preachers, and with authority to silence them, (as is evident in the first chapter of that Epistle) these Elders (I say) are verily, and indeed such as himselfe call's Bishops in the proper sense, and accepitation of the word.

6. The *Cretan* Presbyters who were there before S. *Titus* comming, had not power to ordaine others, that is, had not that power which *Titus* had. For *Titus* was sent thither for that purpose, therefore to supply the want of that power. And now, because to ordaine others was necessary for the conservation

servation and succession of the Church, that is, because new generations are necessary for the continuing the world, and meere Presbyters could not doe it, and yet this must be done, not onely by *Titus* himselfe, but after him, it followes undeniably that S. *Paul* sent *Titus* to ordaine men with the same power that himselfe had, that is with more then his first *Cretan* Presbyters, that is Bishops, and he meanes them in the proper sense.

7. That by *Elders in severall Cityes* he meanes Bishops is also plaine from the place where they were to be ordaind, κατὰ πόλιν, not κατὰ κώμην, or κατὰ πολίχνιον. *In populous Cityes, not in village Townes,* For no Bishops were ever suffered to be in village Townes, as is to be seene in the Councell of [a] *Sardis*, of [b] *Chalcedon*, and S. [c] *Leo*, the Cityes therefore doe at least highly intimate that the persons to be ordain'd were not meere Presbyters.

[a] *cap.* 6.
[b] *can.* 17.
[c] *Epist* 87. *ad Episc. Afric.*

The issue of this discourse is, that since *Titus* was sent to *Crete* to ordaine Bishops, himselfe was a Bishop to be sure, at least. If he had ordain'd only Presbyters, it would have prov'd that. But this inferres him to be a *Metropolitan*, forasmuch as he was Bishop of *Crete*, and yet had many suffragans in subordination to him, of his owne constitution, and yet of proper dioceses. However, if this discourse concludes nothing peculiar, it frees the place from popular prejudice and mistakes, upon the confusion of *Episcopus*, and *Presbyter*; and at least inferres his being a Bishop, if not a great deale more.

Yea; but did not S. *Titus* ordaine no *meere Presbyters?* yes most certainely. But, so he did *Deacons* too, and yet neither one nor the other are otherwise mentioned in this Epistle but by consequence and comprehension within the superior order. For he that ordaines a Bishop, first makes him a *Deacon*, (and then he obtaines καλὸν βαθμὸν *a good degree*) and then a *Presbyter*, and then a *Bishop*. So that these inferior orders are presuppos'd in the authorizing the Supreame, and by giving direction for the qualifications of Bishops, he sufficiently instructs the inferiour orders in their deportment, insomuch as they are probations for advancement to the higher.

2. Adde to this, that he that ordaines Bishops in Cityes sets there τάξιν γεννητικὴν, *ordinem generativum Patrum*, as *Epiphanius* calls Episcopacy, and therefore most certainely with intention, not that it should be χεὶρ ἄκαρπος *Manus Mortua*, but, to produce others, and therefore Presbyters and Deacons.

3. S. *Paul* made no expresse provision for villages, and yet most certainely did not intend to leave them destitute, and therefore he tooke order that such ordinations should be made in Cityes which should be provisionary for Villages, and that is, of such men as had power to ordaine and power to send Presbyters to what part of their charge they pleased. For since Presbyters could not ordaine other Presbyters, as appeares by S. *Paul's* sending *Titus* to doe it there, where, most certainely, many Presbyters before were actually resident, if Presbyters had gone to Villages they must

must have left the Cityes destitute, or if they staid in Cityes the Villages would have perished, and at last, when these men had dyed both one and the other, had beene made a prey to the wolfe, for there could be no sheapheard after the decay of the first generation.

But let us see further into S. *Titus* his commission and letters of orders, and institution. [*A man that is an heretick after the first and second admonition reject.*] Cognisance of hereticall pravity, and animadversion against the heretick himselfe is most plainely concredited to S. *Titus*. For first he is to admonish him, then to reject him upon his pertinacy, from the Catholike communion. *Cogere autem illos videtur qui sæpe corripit*, saith S. *Ambrose*, upon the establishing a coactive, or coërcitive jurisdiction over the Clergy and whole Dioceſſe. Tit. 3.10.

But I need not specifie any more particulars, for S. *Paul* committed to S. *Titus* πᾶσαν ἐπιταγὴν, *all authority and power*. The consequence is that which S. *Ambrose* prefixes to the Comentary on this Epistle. *Titum Apostolus consecravit Episcopum, & ideò commonet eum ut sit sollicitus in Ecclesiasticâ ordinatione, id est, ad quosdam qui simulatione quâdam dignos se ostentabant ut sublimem ordinem tenerent, simulq; & hæreticos ex circumcisione corripiendos.* 2. Titus. 15.

And now after so faire preparatory of Scripture we may heare the testimonies of Antiquity witnessing that *Titus* was by S. *Paul* made Bishop of *Crete*. *Sed & Lucas* (saith *Eusebius*) *in actibus Apostolorum.... Timothei meminit & Titi quorum alter in E-* lib. 3. c. 4.

pheso Episcopus: alter ordinandis apud Cretam Ecclesiis ab eo ordinatus præficitur. That is it which S. *Ambrose* expresses somethingmore plainly, *Titum Apostolus consecravit Episcopum*, *The Apostle consecrated Titus Bishop*; and *Theodoret*, calling *Titus*, *Cretensium Episcopum. The Bishop of the Cretians.* And for this reason saith S. *Chrysost.* S. *Paul* did not write to *Sylvanus*, or *Silas*, or *Clemens*, but to *Timothy* and *Titus* ὅτι τέτοις ἤδη ἐκκλησίας ἦν ἐγκεχειρικώς, *because to these he had already committed the government of Churches.* But a fuller testimony of S. *Titus* being a Bishop who please may see in S. [a] *Hierome*, in [b] *Dorotheus*, in [c] *Isidore*, in [d] *Vincentius*, in [e] *Theodoret*, in [f] S. *Gregory*, in [g] *Primatius*, [h] *Sedulius*, [i] *Theophilact* and [k] *Nicephorus*. To which if we adde the subscription of the Epistle asserted from all impertinent objections by the clearer testimony of S. [l] *Athanasius*, S[m] *Ierome*, the Syriack translation, [n] *Oecumenius* and [o] *Theophylact*, no confident deniall can ever break through, or scape conviction.

ubi supra.

in 1. Tim. 3.

a *de Script: Eccl. in* Tito.
b *in Synops.*
c *de vita & morte. SS. anct.*
d *lib.* 38. *c.* 10.
e *apud Oecumen in præfat. in* Tit. *& in* 1 Timoth. 3.
f *in pastor. part.* 2. *c.* 11.
g *præfat: in* 1. Tim. *& in* 2. Tim. 1.
h *in* 1. Tim. 1. *& in* 2. Tim. 1. 6.
i *in* 1. Tit.
k *lib.* 2. *c.* 34.
l *in Synopsi Sacr. Script.*
m *ad Paulam & Eustoch.*
n *Comment. ad* Titum.
o *ibid.*

And now I know not what objection can fairely be made here; for I hope S. *Titus* was no *Evangelist*, he is not called so in Scripture, and all Antiquity calls him a Bishop, and the nature of his offices, the eminence of his dignity, the superiority of jurisdiction, the cognisance of causes criminall, and the whole exigence of the Epistle proclaime him Bishop. But suppose a while *Titus* had been an Evangelist, I would faine know who succeeded him? Or did all his office expire with his person? If so, then who shall reject Hereticks when *Titus* is dead? Who shall

shall silence factious Preachers? If not, then still who succeeded him? The Presbyters? How can that be? For if they had more power after his death then before, and govern'd the Churches which before they did not, then to be sure their government in common, is not an Apostolicall Ordinance, much lesse is it a Divine right, for it is postnate to thē both. But if they had no more power after *Titus* then they had under him, how then could they succeed him? There was indeed a dereliction of the authority, but no succession. The succession therefore both in the *Metropolis* of *Crete*, and also in the other Cities was made by singular persons, not by a Colledge, for so we find in the διαδοχαὶ recorded by *Eusebius* that in *Gnossus* of *Crete*, *Pinytus* was a most eminent Bishop, and that *Philip* was the Metropolitan at *Gortyna*. *Sed & Pinytus nobilissimus apud Cretam in Episcopus fuit*, saith *Eusebius*. But of this, enough. *lib.4.c.21.*

§. 16.

MY next instance shall be of one that was an *Evangelist* indeed, one that writ the Gospell, and he was a Bishop of *Alexandria*. In Scripture we find nothing of him but that he was an Evangelist, and a Deacon, for he was Deacon to S. *Paul* & *Barnabas*, when they went to the Gentiles, by ordination and speciall designement made at *Antioch*; συμπαραλαβόντες τὸν Ἰωάννην τὸν ἐπικληθέντα Μάρκον εἶχον τὸν Ἰωάννην ὑπηρέτην. They had *John* to be their Minister; *viz*: *John* whose firname was *Marke*. * But we are not to expect all the ordinations made by the Apostles

S. Marke at Alexandria,

Acts. 12. & Acts. 13.

Apostles in their acts written by S. *Luke*, which end at *S. Paul's* first going to *Rome*; but many other things, their founding of diverse Churches, their ordination of Bishops, their journeyes, their persecutions, their Miracles and Martyrdomes are recorded, & rely upon the faith of the primitive Church. And yet the ordination of S. *Marke* was within the terme of S. *Lukes* story, for his successor *Anianus* was made Bishop of *Alexandria* in the eight yeare of *Nero's* reigne, five or six yeares before the death of S. *Paul*. *Igitur Neronis* PRIMO *Imperij anno post Marcum Evangelistam Ecclesiæ apud Alexandriam Anianus Sacerdotium suscepit.* So the Latin of *Ruffinus* reads it, in stead of *octavo Sacerdotium*, λειτυργίαν, that is the Bishoprick, for else there were many λείτυργοι, and Priests in *Alexandria* besides him, and how then he should be S. *Markes* successor more then the other Presbyters, is not so soone to be contriv'd. But so the *Collecta* of the Chapter runs. *Quòd post Marcum primus Episcopus Alexandrinæ Ecclesiæ ordinatus sit Anianus*, *Anianus was consecrated the first Bishop of Alexandria after S. Marke.* * And *Philo* the Iew telling the story of the Christians in *Alexandria*, called by the inhabitants, *Cultores*, and *Cultrices*, The *worshippers*, *Addit autem adhuc his* (saith *Eusebius*) *quomodò sacerdotes vel Ministri exhibeant officia sua, vel quæ sit suprà omnia* Episcopalis *apicis sedes*, intimating that beside the offices of Priests and Ministers, there was an Episcopall dignity which was *apex super omnia*, a height above all imployments, estab lished at *Alexandria*;

lib. 2 hist. cap. 17.

andria; and how soone that was, is soone computed, for *Philo* liv'd in our blessed Saviours time, and was Embassador to the Emperour *Cajus*, and surviv'd S. *Marke* a little.

But S. *Ierome* will strike up this businesse, *A Marco Evangelista ad Heraclam usq;, & Dionysium Episcopos, Presbyteri Egypti semper unum ex se electum in celsiori gradu collocatum Episcopum nominabant.* And againe, *Marcus interpres Apostoli Petri, & Alexandrinæ Ecclesiæ primus Episcopus*. The same is witnessed by [a] S. *Gregory*, [b] *Nicephorus*, and divers others.

Epist. ad Evagr.

de Script: Eccles. & in proëm in Matth.

a *lib. 6. Epist.* 37 1.

b *lib* 14. *cap* 39.

Now although the ordination of S. *Marke* is not specified in the Acts, as innumerable multitudes of things more, and scarce any thing at all of any of the twelve but S. *Peter*, nothing of S. *Iames* the sonne of *Thaddæus*, nor of *Alpheus*, but the Martyrdome of one of them, nothing of S. *Bartholomew*, of S. *Thomas*, of *Simon zelotes*, of S. *Iude* the Apostle, scarce any of their names recorded, yet no wise man can distrust the faith of such records, which all Christendome hitherto, so farre as we know, hath acknowledged as authentick, and these ordinations cannot possibly goe lesse then Apostolicall, being done in the Apostles times, to whom the care of all the Churches was concredited, they seeing and beholding severall successions in severall Churches before their death, as here at *Alexandria*, first Saint *Marke*, then *Anianus*, made Bishop five or sixe years before the death of S. *Peter* and S. *Paul*. But yet who it was that ordain'd S. *Marke* Bishop of *Alex-*

Alexandria (for Bishop he was most certainly) is not obscurely intimated by the most excellent man S. *Gelasius* in the Romane Councell, *Marcus à Petro Apostolo in Ægyptum directus verbum veritatis prædicavit, & gloriosè consummavit Martyrium.* S. *Peter* sent him into *Egypt* to found a Church, and therefore would furnish him with all things requisite for so great imployment, and that could be no lesse, then the ordinary power Apostolicall.

In decret. de lib. authent. & apocryph.

§ 17. S. *Linus*, and S. *Clement* at *Rome.*

BUt in the Church of *Rome*, the ordination of Bishops by the Apostles, and their successions during the times of the Apostles, is very manifest by a concurrent testimony of old writers. *Fundantes igitur, & instruentes beati Apostoli Ecclesiam Lino Episcopatum administrandæ Ecclesiæ tradiderunt. Hujus Lini Paulus in his quæ sunt ad Timotheum Epistolis meminit. Succedit autem ei Anacletus, post eum tertiò loco ab Apostolis Episcopatum sortitur Clemens, qui & vidit ipsos Apostolos, & contulit cum eis, cùm adhuc insonantem prædicationem Apostolorum, & traditionem ante oculos haberet.* So S. *Irenæus.* * *Memoratur autem ex comitibus Pauli Crescens quidam ad Gallias esse præfectus. Linus vero & Clemens in urbe Româ Ecclesiæ præfuisse.* Many more testimonies there are of these men's being ordained Bishops of *Rome* by the Apostles, as of [a] *Tertullian*, [b] *Optatus*, [c] S. *Austin*, and [d] S. *Hierome.* But I will not cloy my Reader with variety of one dish, and bee tedious in a thing so evident and known.

lib. 3 *cap.* 3. * *Euseb. lib.* 3. *cap.* 4.

a *de præscript.*
b *lib.* 2. *contr. Parmen.*
c *Epist.* 65.
d *de Script. Eccles.*

S. *John*

§ 18.

S. *Polycarpe* at *Smyrna*, & diverse others.

S. *Iohn* ordain'd S. *Polycarpe* Bishop at *Smyrna* .... *sicut Smyrnæorum Ecclesia habens Polycarpum ab Iohanne conlocatum refert; sicut Romanorum Clementem à Petro ordinatum edit, proinde utiq; & cæteræ exhibent quos ab Apostolis in Episcopatum constitutos Apostolici seminis traduces habeant.* So *Tertullian.* The Church of *Smyrna* saith that *Polycarpe* was placed there by S. *Iohn*, as the Church of *Rome* saith that *Clement* was ordain'd there by S. *Peter*, and other Churches have those whom the Apostles made to be their Bishops. *Polycarpus autem non solùm ab Apostolis edoctus .... sed etiam ab Apostolis in Asiâ, in eâ quæ est Smyrnis Ecclesiâ constitutus Episcopus .... & testimonium his perhibent quæ sunt in Asiâ Ecclesiæ omnes, & qui usq; adhuc successerunt Polycarpo &c.* The same also is witnessed by S. *Ierome*, and * *Eusebius: Quoniam autem valdè longum est in tali volumine omnium Ecclesiarum successiones enumerare*, to use S. *Irenæus* his expression; It were an infinite labour to reckon up all those whom the Apostles made Bishops with their own hands, as [a] S. *Dionysius* the Areopagite at *Athens*, [b] *Cajus* at *Thessalonica*, [c] *Archippus* at *Colosse*, [d] *Onesimus* at *Ephesus*, [e] *Antipas* at *Pergamus*, [f] *Epaphroditus* at *Philippi*, [g] *Crescens* among the *Gaules*, [h] *Evodias* at *Antioch*, * *Sosipater* at *Iconium*, *Erastus* in *Macedonia*, *Trophimus* at *Arles*, *Iason* at *Tarsus*, *Silas* at *Corinth*, *Onesipherus* at *Colophon*, *Quartus*

De Præscript.

De Script. Eccles. lib. 3. c. 35.

a *Euseb. l. 4. c. 23. & lib. 3. c. 4*

b *Origen. lib. 10. in 16. Rom.*

c *S. Ambros. in 4 Coloss.*

d *Ignatius Epist. ad Ephes. & Euseb. lib. 3. c. 35.*

e *Arethas in 1. Apocal.*

f *Epist. ad Philip. & Theodoret. ib. & in 1. Tim. 3.*

g *Euseb. l. 3. c. 4. apud Gallias.* So *Rufinus* reads it. *In Galatia*, so *Epist. ad Antiech. & Euseb. lib 3. c. 22.* * *In Martyrologio Romano*

is intimated in Scripture, and so the Roman *Martyrol.* h *Ignatius*

at *Berytus*, *Paul* the Proconsul at *Narbona*, besides many more whose names are not recorded in Scripture, as these forecited are, so many as * *Eusebius* counts impossible to enumerate; it shall therefore suffice to summe up this digest of their acts and ordinations in those generall foldings us'd by the Fathers, saying that the Apostles did ordaine Bishops in all Churches, that the succession of Bishops downe from the Apostles first ordination of them was the only argument to prove their Churches Catholick, and their adversaries who could not doe so, to be Hereticall; This also is very evident, and of great consideration in the first ages while their tradition was cleare, and evident, and not so bepudled as it since hath been with the mixture of Hereticks, striving to spoile that which did so much mischiefe to their causes.

lib. 3. cap. 37.

Edant origines Ecclesiarum suarum, evolvant ordinem Episcoporum suorum ita per successiones ab initio decurrentem, ut primus ille Episcopus aliquem ex Apostolis, aut Apostolicis viris habuerit authorem & antecessorem, hoc modo Ecclesiæ Apostolicæ census suos deferunt, &c. And when S. *Irenæus* had reckoned twelve successions in the Church of *Rome* from the Apostles, *nunc duodecimo loco ab Apostolis Episcopatum habet Eleutherius. Hâc ordinatione* (saith he) *& successione, & ea quæ est ab Apostolis in Ecclesiâ traditio & veritatis præconiatio pervenit usq; ad nos; & est plenissima hæc ostensio unam & eandem vivatricem fidem esse quæ in Ecclesiâ ab Apostolis usq; nunc sit conservata, & tradita in veritate.* So that this

Lib. 3. cap. 3.

this succession of Bishops from the Apostles ordination, must of it selfe be a very certain thing, when the Church made it a maine probation of their faith; for the books of Scripture were not all gathered together, and generally received as yet. Now then, since this was a main pillar of their Christianity, *viz.* a constant reception of it from hand to hand, as being delivered by the *Bishops* in every chaire, till wee come to the very Apostles that did ordain them, this (I say) being their proof, although it could not be more certain then the thing to be proved, which in that case was a Divine revelation, yet to them it was more evident as being matter of fact, and known almost by evidence of sense, and as verily believed by all, as it was by any one, that himselfe was baptized, both relying upon the report of others. * *Radix Christianæ societatis per sedes Apostolorum, & successiones Episcoporum, certâ per orbem propagatione diffunditur*, saith *S. Austin.* The very root and foundation of Christian communion is spread all over the world, by the successions of Apostles and Bishops. Epist. 42.

And is it not now a madnesse to say there was no such thing, no succession of Bishops in the Churches Apostolicall, no ordination of Bishops by the Apostles, and so (as S. *Paul's* phrase is) *overthrow the faith of some*, even of the Primitive Christians, that used this argument as a great weapon of offence against the invasion of hæreticks and factious people? It is enough for us that we can truly say with S. *Irenæus, Habemus annumerare eos qui ab Apostolis* Ubi supra.

postolis instituti sunt Episcopi in Ecclesiis usq; ad nos. We can reckon those who from the Apostles untill now were made Bishops in the Churches; and of this we are sure enough, if there be any faith in Christians.

§ 19. So that Episcopacy is at least an Apostolicall ordinance:

of the same authority with many other points generally believed.

THe summe is this. Although we had not prooved the immediate Divine institution of Episcopall power over Presbyters and the whole flock, yet Episcopacy is not lesse then an Apostolicall ordinance, and delivered to us by the same authority that the observation of the *Lord's day* is. For, for that in the new Testament we have no precept, and nothing but the example of the Primitive Disciples meeting in their *Synaxes* upon that day, and so also they did on the saturday in the Iewish Synagogues, but yet (however that at *Geneva*, they were once in meditation to have chang'd it into a Thursday meeting to have showne their Christian liberty) we should think strangely of those men that called the *Sunday-Festivall* lesse then an Apostolicall ordinance, and necessary now to be kept holy with such observances as the Church hath appointed.

* Baptisme of infants is most certainly a holy and charitable ordinance, and of ordinary necessity to all that ever cryed, and yet the Church hath founded this rite upon the tradition of the Apostles; and wise men doe easily observe that the *Anabaptists* can by the same probability of Scripture inforce a necessity of communicating infants upon us, as we doe of baptizing infants upon them, if we speak

speak of immediate Divine institution, or of practise Apostolicall recorded in Scripture, and therefore a great Master of *Geneva* in a book he writ against the *Anabaptists*, was forced to fly to Apostolicall traditive ordination, and therefore the institution of Bishops, must be served first, as having fairer plea, and clearer evidence in Scripture, then the baptizing of infants, and yet they that deny this, are by the just *anathema* of the Catholick Church, confidently condemn'd for Hereticks.

* Of the same consideration are diverse other things in Christianity, as the Presbyters consecrating the Eucharist; for if the Apostles in the first institution did represent the whole Church, Clergy and Laity, when Christ said [*Hoc facite, Doe this*] then why may not every Christian man there represented, doe that which the Apostles in the name of all were commanded to doe? If the Apostles did not represent the whole Church, why then doe all communicate? Or what place, or intimation of Christ's saying is there in all the foure Gospells, limiting [*Hoc facite, id est, benedicite*] to the Clergy, and extending [*Hoc facite, id est, accipite & manducate*] to the Laity? This also rests upon the practise Apostolicall and traditive interpretation of H. Church, and yet cannot be denied that so it ought to be, by any man that would not have his Christendome suspected.

* To these I adde the communion of Women, the distinction of bookes Apocryphall, from Canonicall, that such books were written by such Evan-

geliſts, and Apoſtles, the whole tradition of Scripture it ſelfe, the Apoſtles Creed, the feaſt of *Eaſter* (which amongſt all them that cry up the *Sunday. Feſtivall* for a *Divine inſtitution*, muſt needs prevaile as *Caput inſtitutionis*, it being that for which the Sunday is commemorated.) Theſe and divers others of greater conſequence (which I dare not ſpecify for feare of being miſunderſtood) rely but upon equall faith with this of Epiſcopacy (though I ſhould wave all the arguments for immediate Divine ordinance) and therefore it is but reaſonable it ſhould be ranked amongſt the *Credenda* of Chriſtianity, which the Church hath entertained upon the confidence of that which we call *the faith of a Chriſtian*, whoſe Maſter is truth it ſelfe.

§ 20. And was an office of power and great authority,

WHat their power and eminence was, and the appropriates of their office ſo ordain'd by the Apoſtles, appears alſo by the teſtimonies before alleadged, the expreſſions whereof runne in theſe high termes. *Epiſcopatus adminiſtrandæ Eccleſiæ in Lino. Linus* his Biſhoprick was the adminiſtration of the whole Church. *Eccleſiæ præfuiſſe* was ſaid of him and *Clemens*, they were both Prefects of the Church, or *Prelates*, that's the Church-word. *Ordinandis apud Cretam Eccleſiis præficitur*, ſo *Titus*, he is ſet over all the affaires of the new-founded Churches in *Crete*. *In celſiori gradu collocatus, plac'd in a higher order or degree*, ſo the Biſhop of *Alexandria*, choſen *ex Presbyteris, from amongſt the Presbyters. Supra omnia Epiſcopalis api-*

cis

cis sedes, so *Philo* of that Bishoprick, *The seat of Episcopall height above all things in Christianity*. These are its honours. Its offices these. τὰ λείποντα διορθοῦσθαι, ἐπισομίζειν ἀνυποτάκτους, καὶ ματαιολόγους &c. *To set in order whatsoever he sees wanting, or amisse; to silence vaine prating Preachers, that will not submit to their superiors, to ordaine elders, to rebuke delinquents, to reject Hereticks, viz.* from the communion of the faithfull (for else why was the Angell of the Church of *Pergamus* reprov'd for tolerating the *Nicolaitan* hereticks, but that it was in his power to eject them? And the same is the case of the Angell of *Thyatira* in permitting the woman to teach and seduce the people) but to the Bishop was committed the cognisance of causes criminall and particular of Presbyters, (so to *Timothy* in the instance formerly alleadged) nay, πᾶσα ἐπιταγὴ, *all authority*, so in the case of *Titus*, and *officium regendæ Ecclesiæ, the office of ruling the Church*, so to them all whom the Apostles left in the severall Churches respectively which they had new founded. So *Eusebius*. For the Bishop was ἐπὶ πᾶσι καθιστὼς, *set over all*, Clergy and Laity, saith S. *Clement*. *Vbi supra. apud Euseb. lib. 3. cap. 23.*

This was given to Bishops by the Apostles themselves, and this was not given to Presbyters, as I have already prooved, and for the present, it will sufficiently appeare in this, that Bishops had power over Presbyters, which cannot be supposed they had over themselves, unlesse they could be their own superiours.

But

§. 21. Not lessened by the assistance and Councell of Presbyters,

BUt a Councell, or Colledge of Presbyters might have jurisdiction over any one, and such Colledges there were in the Apostles times, and they did *in communi Ecclesiam regere, govern the Church in common with the Bishop*, as saith S. *Hierom*, *viz.* where there was a Bishop, and where there was none they rul'd without him. This indeed will call us to a new account, and it relies upon the testimony of S. *Hierome* which I will set downe here, that wee may leave the sunne without a cloud.

Comment. in ep. ad Titum.

S. *Ierom's* words are these.

"*Idem est enim Presbyter quod Episcopus, & antequam Diaboli instinctu studia in religione fierent, & diceretur in populis, ego sum Pauli ego Apollo, ego autem Cephæ, communi Presbyterorum consilio Ecclesiæ gubernabantur. Postquam verò unusquisq; eos quos baptizabat suos putabat esse, non Christi, in toto orbe decretum est, ut unus de Presbyteris electus superponeretur cæteris ut Schismatum semina tollerentur.*

Then he brings some arguments to confirme his saying, and summes them up thus.

"*Hæc diximus ut ostenderemus apud veteres eosdem fuisse Presbyteros quos Episcopos, & ut Episcopi noverint se magis consuetudine quàm Dominicæ dispositionis veritate Presbyteris esse majores: & in communi debere Ecclesiam regere, &c.*

The thing S. *Hierome* aymes to prove, is the *identity* of *Bishop*, *Presbyter*, and their government of the

the Church *in common.* * For their *identity*, It is cleare that S. *Hierome* does not meane it in respect of order, as if a Bishop and a Presbyter had both one office *per omnia*, one power; for else he contradicts himselfe most apertly, for in his Epistle *ad Evagrium*, *Quid facit* (saith he) *Episcopus exceptâ ordinatione quòd Presbyter non faciat? A Presbyter may not ordayne, a Bishop does*, which is a cleare difference of power, and by S. *Hierome* is not expressed in matter of *fact*, but of *right* [*quod Presbyter non* FACIAT] not [*non facit*;] that a Priest *may not, must not* doe, that a Bishop does, *viz.* he gives holy orders. * And for matter of fact S. *Hierome* knew that in his time a Presbyter did not governe in common, but because he conceived it was fit he should be joyn'd in the common regiment and care of the Diocesse, therefore he asserted it as much as he could; And therefore if S. *Hierome* had thought that this difference of the power of ordination, had been only customary, & by actuall indulgence, or incroachment, or positive constitution, and no matter of primitive and originall right, S. *Hierome* was not so diffident but out it should, come what would have come. And suppose S. *Hierome*, in this distinct power of ordination had intended it onely to be a difference in *fact*, not in *right* (for so some of late have muttered) then S. *Hierome* had not said true according to his owne principles, for [*Quid facit Episcopus exceptâ ordinatione quòd Presbyter non faciat?*] had beene quickly answered, if the Question had onely beene *de facto*; For the Bishop governed

the Church alone, and so in Iurisdiction was greater then Presbyters, and this was by custome, and in fact at least, S. *Hierome* saies it, and the Bishop tooke so much power to himselfe, that *de facto* Presbyters were not suffered to doe any thing *sine literis Episcopalibus, without leave of the Bishop*, and this S. *Hierome* complain'd of; so that *de facto* the power of ordination was not the onely difference: That then (if S. *Hierome* sayes true) being the onely difference betweene Presbyter and Bishop, must be meant *de jure*, in matter of right, not *humane positive*, for that is coincident with the other power of jurisdiction which *de facto*, and at least by a humane right the Bishop had over Presbyters, but *Divine*, and then this identity of Bishop and Presbyter by S. *Hierom's* owne confession cannot be meant in respect of order, but that Episcopacy is by Divine right a Superiour order to the Presbyterate.

Ad Nepotian. & de 7. ordin. Eccles.

* Adde to this that the arguments which S. *Hierome* uses in this discourse are to prove that *Bishops* are sometimes called *Presbyters*. To this purpose he urges *Act.* 20. And *Philippians* 1. and the Epistles to *Timothy*, and *Titus*, and some others, but all driving to the same issue. To what? Not to prove that Presbyters are sometimes called Presbyters; For who doubts that? But that Bishops are so may be of some consideration and needes a proofe, and this he Undertooke. Now that they are so called must needes inferre an *identity* and a *disparity* in severall respects. An *identity*, at least of *Names*, for else it had beene wholly impertinent. A *disparity*,

or

or else his arguments were to prove *idem affirmari de eodem*, which were a businesse next to telling pins. Now then this disparity must be either in *order*, or *jurisdiction*. By the former probation it is sure that he meanes the *orders* to be *disparate*; If *jurisdiction too*, I am content, but the former is most certaine, if he stand to his owne principles.

This identity then which *S. Hierome* expresses of Episcopus and Presbyter, must be either in Name or in Iurisdiction. I know not certainely which he meanes, for his *arguments conclude onely for the identity of Names*, but his *conclusion is for identity of jurisdiction, & in communi debere Ecclesiam regere*, is the intent of his discourse. If he meanes the first, viz: that of *Names*, it is well enough, there is no harme done, it is *in confesso apud omnes*, but concludes nothing (as I shall shew hereafter) but because he intends (so farre as may be gues'd by his words) a parity and concurrence of jurisdiction, this must be consider'd distinctly.

1. Then; in the first founding of Churches the Apostles did appoint Presbyters, and inferiour Ministers with a power of baptizing, preaching, consecrating and reconciling *in privato foro*, but did not in every Church at the first founding it, constitute a Bishop. This is evident in *Crete*, in *Ephesus*, in *Corinth*, at *Rome*, at *Antioch*.

2. Where no *Bishops* were constituted there the *Apostles* kept the *jurisdiction in their owne hands* [*There comes upon me* (saith S. *Paul*) *daily the care or Supravision of all the Churches*] Not *all absolutely*,

for not all of the Circumcision, but *all of his charge*, with which he was once charged, and of which he had not exonerated himselfe by constituting Bishops there, for of these there is the same reason And a-
2. Thess. 3. 14. gaine [*If any man obey not our word* διὰ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς τοῦτον σημειοῦσθε, *signifie him to me by an Epistle*] so he charges the *Thessalonians*, and therefore of this Church, S. *Paul* as yet, clearely kept the power in his owne hands. So that the Church was ever in all the parts of it, *govern'd by Episcopall, or Apostolicall authority.*

3. For ought appeares in Scripture, the Apostles never gave any *externall*, or *coercitive jurisdiction in publike, and criminall causes*, nor yet *power to ordaine Rites or Ceremonies, or to inflict censures, to a Colledge of meere Presbyters.* * The contrary may be greedily swallowed, and I know not with how great confidence, and prescribing prejudice; but there is not in all Scripture *any commission from Christ, any ordinance or warrant from the Apostles to any Presbyter, or Colledge of Presbyters without a Bishop, or expresse delegation of Apostolicall authority* (*tanquam vicario suo*, as to his *substitute* in absense of the *Bishop or Apostle*) to inflict any *censures*, or take *cognisance of persons* and *causes criminall.* Presbyters might be *surrogati in locum Episcopi absentis*, but never had any *ordinary jurisdiction* given them by *vertue of their ordination*, or *any commission, from Christ or his Apostles.*

This we may best consider by induction of particulars.

1. There

1. There was a *Presbytery* at *Ierusalem*, but they had a *Bishop alwayes*, and the *Colledge of the Apostles sometimes*, therefore whatsoever act they did, it was in conjunction with, and *subordination to the Bishop* & *Apostles*. Now it cannot be denyed both that the *Apostles* were *superiour* to all the *Presbyters in Ierusalem*, and also had power alone to governe the Church. I say they had power to governe alone, for they had the government of the Church alone before they ordayn'd the first *Presbyters*, that is before there were any of capacity to joyne with them, they must doe it themselves, and then also they must retaine the same power, for they could not loose it by giving Orders. Now if they had a *power* of *sole jurisdiction*, then the *Presbyters* being in some publike acts in conjunction with the *Apostles* cannot challenge a right of governing as affixed to their Order, they onely *assisting in subordination*, and *by dependency*.

This onely by the way; In *Ierusalem* the *Presbyters* were some thing more then ordinary, and were not meere *Presbyters* in the present, and limited sense of the word. For *Barnabas*, and *Iudas*, and *Silas* [ἀνδρες ἡγουμένους S. *Luke* calls them] were of that *Presbytery*. Καὶ αὐτοὶ προφῆται ὄντες. They were *Rulers*, and *Prophets*, Chiefe men amongst the Brethren, & yet called *Elders*, or *Presbyters* though of *Apostolicall power* and authority, ὅτι καὶ πρεσβυτέρων εἶχον ἀξίαν οἱ Ἀπόστολοι saith *Oecumenius*. For truth is, that diverse of them were ordain'd *Apostles* with an *Vnlimited jurisdiction*, not fix'd upon any See, that

Act. 15.

in Act. Apost.

they also might together with the twelve, *exire in totum mundum.* * So that in this *Presbytery* either they were more then meere *Presbyters*, as *Barnabas*, and *Iudas*, and *Silas*, men of *Apostolicall power*, and they might well be in conjunction with the twelve, and with the *Bishop*, they were of equall power, not by vertue of their *Presbyterate*, but by their *Apostolate*; or if they were but meere *Presbyters*, yet because it is certaine, and proov'd, and confess'd that the Apostles had power to governe the Church alone, this their taking meere *Presbyters in partem regiminis*, was a voluntary act, and from this example was derived to other Churches, and then it is most true, that *Presbyteros in communi Ecclesiam regere*, was rather, *consuetudine Ecclesiæ*, then *dominicæ dispositionis veritate*, (to use S. *Hierom's* owne expression) for this is more evident then that *Bishops*, doe *eminere cæteris*, by *custome* rather then *Divine institution*. For if the Apostles might rule the Church alone, then that the *Presbyters* were taken into the Number was a voluntary act of the *Apostles*, and although fitting to be retain'd where the same reasons doe remaine, and circumstances concurre, yet not necessary because not affixed to their Order; not, *Dominicæ dispositionis veritate*, and not laudable when those reasons cease, and there is an emergency of contrary causes.

2. The next *Presbytery* we read of is at *Antioch*, but there we find no *acts* either of *concurrent*, or *single jurisdiction*, but of *ordination* indeed we doe, and that performed by such men as S. *Paul* was, and

Act. 13.

Barnabas,

Barnabas, for they were two of the *Prophets* reckoned in the Church of *Antioch*, but I doe not remember them to be called *Presbyters* in that place, to be ſure they were not meere *Presbyters* as we now Underſtand the word; as I proved formerly.

3. But in the Church of *Epheſus* there was a Colledge of *Presbyters* and they were by the Spirit of God called *Biſhops*, and were appointed by him to be Paſtors of the Church of God. This muſt doe it or nothing. *In quo ſpiritus S. poſuit vos Epiſcopos*, In whom the *holy Ghoſt* hath made you *Biſhops*. There muſt lay the exigence of the argument, and if we can find who is meant by [Vos] we ſhall, I hope, gaine the truth. * S. *Paul* ſent for the *Presbyters*, or *Elders* to come from *Epheſus* to *Miletus*, and to them he ſpoke. * * It's true, but that's not all the [*vos*], For there were preſent at that Sermon, *Sopater*, and *Ariſtarchus*, and *Secundus*, and *Gaius*, and *Timothy*, and *Tychicus*, and *Trophimus*; And although he ſent to *Epheſus* as to the Metropolis, and there many Elders were either accidentally, or by ordinary reſidence, yet thoſe were not all Elders of that Church, but of all *Aſia*, in the Scripture ſenſe, the leſſar *Aſia*. For ſo in the preface of his Sermon S. *Paul* intimates [*ye know that from the firſt day I came into Aſia after what manner I have beene with you at all ſeaſons*] His whole converſation in *Aſia* was not confin'd to *Epheſus*, and yet thoſe *Elders* who were preſent were witneſſes of it all, and therefore were of diſperſed habitation, and ſo it is more clearely infer'd from verſ. 25. *And*

Act. 20.

Act. 20. 4.

verſ. 18.

now

now behold I know that YE ALL AMONG WHOM I HAVE GONE *preaching the Kingdome of God* &c: It was a travaile to preach to all that were present, and therefore most certainly they were inhabitants of places very considerably distant.

Now upon this ground I will raise these considerations.

1. If there be a confusion of Names in Scripture, particularly of *Episcopus* and *Presbyter*, as it is contended for, on one side, and granted on all sides, then where both the words are used, what shall determine the signification? For whether (to instance in this place) shall *Presbyter* limit *Episcopus*, or *Episcopus* extend *Presbyter*? Why may not *Presbyter* signify one that is verily a *Bishop*, as *Episcopus* signify a meere *Presbyter*? For it is but an ignorant conceit, where ever *Presbyter* is named, to fancy it in the proper and limited sense, and not to doe so with *Episcopus*, and when they are joyned together, rather to believe it in the limited and present sense of *Presbyter*, then in the proper and present sense of *Episcopus*. So that as yet we are indifferent upon the termes. These men sent for from *Ephesus*, are called πρεσβύτεροι τῆς Ἐκκλησίας, *Elders* or *Presbyters* of the Church, but at *Miletus*, *Spiritus S. posuit vos Episcopos*, there they are called *Bishops* or overseers. So that I may as well say here were *properly so called Bishops*, as another may say, here were *meere Presbyters*. * And least it be objected in prejudice of my affirmative, that they could not be *Bishops*, because they were of *Ephesus*, there never being

ing but one *Bishop in one Church.* I answer, that in the *Apostles* times this was not true. For at *Ierusalem* there were many at the same time that had *Episcopall*, and *Apostolicall authority*, and so at *Antioch*; as at *Ierusalem*, where *Iames*, and *Iudas*, and *Silas*, and the *Apostles*, and *Paul* and *Barnabas* at *Antioch*, and at *Rome*, at the same time *Peter* and *Paul*, and *Linus*, and *Clemens*, but yet but one of them was *fixt*, and *properly the Bishop of that place.* But 2ly All these were not of *Ephesus*, but the *Elders* of all *Asia*, but some from other countries as appears *vers.* 4. So that although they were all *Bishops*, wee might easily find *distinct Dioceses* for them, without incumbring the Church of *Ephesus* with a multiplyed incumbency. Thus farre then we are upon even termes; the community of compellations used here, can no more force us to believe them all to be meere *Presbyters*, then *Bishops* in the proper sense.

2. It is very certain that they were not all meer *Presbyters* at his fare-well Sermon, for S. *Timothy* was there, and I proved him to be a *Bishop* by abundant testimony, and many of those which are reckoned *v.* 4. were companions of the *Apostle* in his journey, and imployed in mission *Apostolicall* for the founding of Churches, and particularly, *Sosipater* was there, and he was *Bishop of Iconium*, and *Tychicus* of *Chalcedon in Bythinia*, as *Dorotheus* and *Eusebius* witnesse; and *Trophimus* of *Arles* in *France*, for so is witnessed by the suffragans of that province in their Epistle to S. *Leo.* But without all doubt here were *Bishops* present as well as *Presbyters*, *Vbi supra.*

ters, for besides the premises we have a witnesse beyond exception, the ancient S. *Irenæus*, *In Mileto enim convocatis Episcopis, & Presbyteris qui erant ab Epheso, & à reliquis proximis civitatibus, quoniam ipse festinavit Hierosolymis Pentecosten agere, &c.* S. *Paul* making haste to keep his Pentecost at *Ierusalem*, at *Miletus*, did call together the *Bishops* and *Presbyters*, from *Ephesus*, and the neighbouring Cities. * Now to all these in conjunction S. *Paul* spoke, and to these indeed the Holy Ghost had committed his Church to be fed, and taught with Pastorall supravision, but in the mean while here is no commission of power, or jurisdiction to Presbyters distinctly, nor supposition of any such præexistent power.

Lib. 3. cap. 14.

3. All that S. *Paul* said in this narration, was spoken in the presence of them all, but not to them all. For that of *v.* 18. [*ye know how I have been with you in Asia in all seasons,*] that indeed was spoke to all the Presbyters that came from *Ephesus* and the voisinage, *viz.* in a collective sense, not in a distributive, for each of them was not in all the circuit of his *Asian* travailes; but this was not spoken to *Sopater* the *Beræan*, or to *Aristarchus* the *Thessalonian*, but to *Tychicus*, and *Trophimus*, who were *Asians* it might be addressed. And for that of *v.* 25. [*yee all among whom I have gone preaching, shall see my face no more,*] this was directed only to the *Asians*, for he was never more to come thither; but *Timothy* to be sure, saw him afterwards, for S. *Paul* sent for him, a litle before his death, to *Rome*, and it will not be

be supposed he neglected to attend him. So that if there were a conjunction of *Bishops*, and *Presbyters* at this meeting, as most certainly there was, and of *Evangelists*, and *Apostolicall men* besides, how shall it be known, or indeed with any probability suspected that, that clause of *vers.* 28. *Spiritus S. posuit vos Episcopos pascere Ecclesiam Dei*, does belong to the *Ephesine Presbyters*, and not particularly to *Timothy*, who was now actually *Bishop of Ephesus*, and to *Gajus*, and to the other *Apostolicall men* who had at least *Episcopall authority*, that is, power of founding, and ordering Churches without a fixt and limited jurisdiction?

4. Either in this place is no jurisdiction at all intimated *de antiquo*, or concredited *de novo*, or if there be, it is in the word ἐπισκόπους, and ποιμαίνειν *v.* 28. *Bishops*, and *Feeders*; and then it belongs either to the *Bishops* alone, or to the *Presbyters* in conjunction with, and subordination to the Bishops, for to the meer *Presbyters* it cannot be proved to appertaine, by any intination of that place.

5. How and if these *Presbyters*, which came from *Ephesus* and the other parts of *Asia* were made Bishops at *Miletus*? Then also this way all difficulty will be removed. And that so it was is more then probable; for to be sure, *Timothy* was now entring, and fixing upon his See; and it was consonant to the practise of the *Apostles*, and the exigence of the thing is selfe, when they were to leave a Church to fixe a Bishop in it; for why else was a Bishop fixt in *Ierusalem*, so long before in other Churches, but because

the *Apostles* were to be scattered from thence, and there the first bloudy field of *Martyrdome* was to be fought. And the case was equall here, for S. *Paul* was never to see the Churches of *Asia* any more, and he foresaw that ravening wolves would enter into the folds, and he had actually plac'd a *Bishop* in *Ephesus*, and it is unimaginable, that he would not make equall provision for other Churches, there being the same necessity from the same danger, in them all, and either S. *Paul* did it now, or never; and that about this time the other sixe *Asian* Churches had *Angels*, or *Bishops* set in their candlesticks, is plain, for there had been a succession in the Church of *Pergamus*, *Antipas* was dead, and S. *Timothy* had sate in *Ephesus*, and S. *Polycarpe* at *Smyrna* many years before S. *Iohn* writ his Revelation.

6. Lastly, that no jurisdiction was in the *Ephesine Presbyters*, except a delegate, and subordinate, appeares beyond all exception, by S. *Pauls* first epistle to *Timothy*, establishing in the person of *Timothy* power of coercitive jurisdiction over *Presbyters*, and ordination in him alone, without the conjunction of any in commission with him, for ought appeares either there, or else-where.

* 4. The same also in the case of the *Cretan Presbyters* is cleare. For what power had they of Iurisdiction? For that is it, we now speak of. If they had none before S. *Titus* came, we are well enough at *Crete*. If they had, why did S. *Paul* take it from them to invest *Titus* with it? Or if he did not, to what purpose did he send *Titus* with all those powers

powers before mentioned? For either the *Presbyters of Crete* had jurisdiction in causes criminall equall to *Titus* after his coming, or they had not. If they had, then what did *Titus* doe there? If they had not, then either they had no jurisdiction at all, or whatsoever it was, it was in subordination to him, they were his inferiours, and he their ordinary Iudge and Governour.

5. One thing more before this be left, must be considered concerning the Church of Corinth, for there was power of excommunication in the *Presbytery* when they had no Bishop, for they had none of diverse yeares after the founding of the Church, and yet S. *Paul* reprooves them for not ejecting the incestuous person out of the Church.

* This is it that I said before, that the Apostles kept the jurisdiction in their hands where they had founded a Church, and placed no Bishop. For in this case of the Corinthian incest the *Apostle* did make himselfe the sole Iudge. [*For I verily as absent in body but present in spirit have judged already*] and then secondly, S. *Paul* gives the Church of *Corinth* commission and substitution to proceed in this cause [*In the name of our Lord Iesus Christ, when ye are gathered together, and* My Spirit, that is, *My power, My authority*, for so he explaines himselfe, My Spirit, With The Power Of Our Lord Iesvs Christ, *to deliver him over to Satan.* And 3. As all this power is delegate, so it is but declarative in the *Corinthians*, for S. *Paul* had given sentence before, and they of Corinth

1. Cor. 5. 3.

V. 4.

were to publish it. 4. This was a commission given to the whole assembly, and no more concernes the *Presbyters*, then the people, and so some have contended; but so it is, but will serve neither of their turnes, neither for an *independant* Presbytery, nor a *conjunctive popularity*. As for S. *Paul's* reprooving them for not inflicting censures on the peccant, I have often heard it confidently averred, but never could see ground for it. The suspicion of it is *v.* 2. [*And ye are puffed up, and have not rather mourned, that he that hath done this deed might be* TAKEN AWAY FROM AMONG YOU] *Taken away*. But by whom? That's the Question. Not by them, to be sure. For TAKEN AWAY FROM YOU, implies that it is by the power of another, not by their act, for no man can take away any thing from himselfe. He may *put it away*, not *take it*, the expression had been very imperfect if this had been his meaning. * Well then: In all these instances, *viz.* of *Ierusalem*, *Antioch*, *Ephesus*, *Crete*, and *Corinth* (and these are all I can find in Scripture of any consideration in the present Question) all the jurisdiction was originally in the *Apostles* while there was no *Bishop*, or in the *Bishop* when there was any; And yet that the *Presbyters* were joyned in the ordering Church affaires I will not deny, to wit, by voluntary assuming them, *in partem sollicitudinis*, and by delegation of power *Apostolicall*, or *Episcopall*, and by way of assistance in acts deliberative, and consiliary, though I find this no where specified but in the Church of *Ierusalem*, where I prooved that the Elders

ders were men of more power then meere *Presbyters*, men of *Apostolicall* authority. But here lies the issue, and straine of the Question.

Presbyters had no jurisdiction in causes criminall, and pertaining to the publick regiment of the Church, by vertue of their order, or without particular substitution, and delegation. For there is not in all Scripture any commission given by *Christ* to meere Presbyters, no divine institution of any power of regiment in the *Presbytery*; no constitution *Apostolicall*, that meere *Presbyters* should either alone, or in conjunction with the *Bishop* governe the Church; no example in all Scripture of any censure inflicted by any meere *Presbyters*, either upon Clergy or Laity; no specification of any power that they had so to doe; but to Churches where Colledges of *Presbyters* were resident, Bishops were sent by *Apostolicall ordination*; not only with power of imposition of hands, but of excommunication, of taking cognisance even of causes, and actions of *Presbyters* themselves, as to *Titus*, and *Timothy*, the Angell of the Church of *Ephesus*; and there is also example of delegation of power of censures from the *Apostle* to a Church where many *Presbyters* were fix't, as in the case of the *Corinthian* delinquent before specified, which delegation was needlesse, if coercitive jurisdiction by censures had been by divine right in a *Presbyter*, or a whole Colledge of them.

Now then, returne we to the consideration of S. *Hieromes* saying: The Church was governed (saith he)

he) *communi Presbyterorum consilio*, by the common Counsell of the Presbyters. But,

1. *Quo jure* was this? That the *Bishops* were Superiour to those which were then called *Presbyters*, by *custome* rather then *Divine disposition* S. *Hierome* affirmes; but that *Presbyters* were joyned with the *Apostles* and *Bishops* at first, by what right was that? Was not that also by *custome* and condescension rather then by *Divine* disposition? S. *Hierome* does not say but it was. For he speakes onely of matter of fact, not of right, It might have beene otherwise, though *de facto* it was so in some places.

* 2. [*Communi Presbyterorum consilio*] is true in the Church of *Ierusalem*, where the Elders were *Apostolicall* men, and had *Episcopall authority* and something superadded, as *Barnabas*, and *Iudas* and *Silas*, for they had the authority and power of *Bishops*, and an unlimited *Diocesse*. Besides, though afterwards *Silas* was fixt upon the See of *Corinth*. But yet even at *Ierusalem* they actually had a *Bishop*, who was in that place superiour to them in Iurisdiction, and therefore does clearely evince, that the common-counsell of *Presbyters* is no argument against the superiority of a *Bishop* over them.

* 3. [*Communi Presbyterorum consilio*] is also true, because the Apostles call'd themselves *Presbyters*, as S. *Peter*, and S. *Iohn*, in their Epistles. Now at the first, many *Prophets*, many *Elders* (for the words are sometimes us'd in common) were for a while resident in particular Churches, and did governe in common; As at *Antioch* were *Barnabas*, and

and *Simeon*, and *Lucius*, and *Manaën*, and *Paul*. *Communi horum Presbyterorum consilio* the Church of *Antioch* for a time was governed; for all these were *Presbyters*, in the sense that S. *Peter* and S. *John* were, and the Elders of the Church of *Ierusalem*.

* 4. Suppose this had beene true in the sense that any body please to imagine, yet this not being by any divine ordinance, that Presbyters should by their Counsell assist in externall regiment of the Church, neither by any intimation of Scripture, nor by affirmation of S. *Hierome*, it is sufficient to stifle this by that saying of S. *Ambrose*, *Postquàm omnibus locis Ecclesiæ sunt constitutæ, & officia ordinata, alitèr composita res est quàm caperat*. It might be so at first *de facto*, and yet no need to be so neither then, nor after. For at first *Ephesus* had no *Bishop* of it's owne, nor *Crete*, and there was no need, for S. *Paul* had the supra-vision of them, and S. *John*, and other of the *Apostles*, but yet afterwards S. *Paul* did send *Bishops* thither; for when themselves were to goe away, the power must be concredited to another; And if they in their absence before the constituting of a *Bishop* had intrusted the care of the Church with *Presbyters*, yet it was but in dependance on the Apostles, and by substitution, not by any ordinary power, and it ceased at the presence or command of the *Apostle*, or the sending of a *Bishop* to reside. ὁι πρεσβύτεροι πεπιάνατε τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν πόιμνιον, ἕως ἀναδείξῃ ὁ θεὸς ὃν μέλλοντα ἄρχειν ὑμῶν. So S. *Ignatius* being absent from his Church upon a businesse of

in Ephes. 4.

Epist. ad Antioch.

being persecuted, he writ to his *Presbyters*, Doe you feed the flock amongst you, till God shall shew you who shall be your Ruler, *viz.* My Successor. No longer. Your commission expires when a *Bishop* comes.

* 5. To the conclusion of S. *Hieromes* discourse, *viz.* That *Bishops* are not greater then *Presbyters* by the truth of divine disposition; I answer, that this is true in this sense, *Bishops* are not by Divine disposition greater then all those which in Scripture are called *Presbyters*, such as were the Elders in the Councell at *Ierusalem*, such as were they of *Antioch*, such as S. *Peter* and S. *Iohn*, συμπρεσβύτεροι, all, and yet all of them were not *Bishops* in the present sense, that is of a fixt and particular Diocesse, and Iurisdiction.

* 2ly S. *Hieromes* meaning is also true in this sense, [*Bishops by the truth of the Lords disposition are not greater then* Presbyters,] viz. *quoad exercitium actus*, that is, they are not tyed to exercise jurisdiction solely in their owne persons, but may *asciscere sibi Presbyteros in commune consilium*, they may delegate jurisdiction to the Presbyters; and that they did not so, but kept the exercise of it only in their owne hands in S. *Hieromes time*, this is it, which he saith is rather by custome, then by Divine dispensation, for it was otherwise at first, viz. *de facto*, and might be so still, there being no law of God against the delegation of power Episcopall. * As for the last words in the objection, [*Et in communi debere Ecclesiam regere,*] it is an *assumentum of* S. *Hieromes owne*, for all his former discourse was of the identity of

of Names, and common regiment *de facto*, not *de jure*, and from *a fact* to conclude with a *Debere*, is a *Non sequitur*, unlesse this *Debere* be understood according to the exigence of the former arguments, that is, THEY OUGHT, not by *Gods law*, but in imitation of the practise *Apostolicall*; to wit, when things are as they were then, when the Presbyters are such as then they were; THEY OUGHT, for many considerations, and in Great cases, not by the necessity of a Divine precept.

* And indeed to doe him right he so explaines himselfe, [*Et in communi debere Ecclesiam regere, imitantes Moysen qui cùm haberet in potestate solus præesse populo Israel, septuaginta elegit, cum quibus populum judicaret.*] The Presbyters ought to Iudge in common with the *Bishop*, for the *Bishops* ought to imitate *Moses*, who might have rul'd alone, yet was content to take others to him, and himselfe only to rule in chiefe. Thus S. *Hierome* would have the *Bishops* doe, but then he acknowledges the right of sole jurisdiction to be in them, and therefore though his Councell perhaps might be good then, yet it is necessary at no time, and was not followed then, and to be sure is needlesse now. * For the arguments which S. *Hierome* uses to prove this his intention what ever it is, I have and shall else where produce, for they yeeld many other considerations then this collection of S. *Hierome*, and prove nothing lesse then the equality of the offices of *Episcopacy* and *Presbyterate*. The same thing is *per omnia* respondent to the paralell place of [a] S. *Chrysostome*,

[a] *In* 1. *Tim.* 3. ὅτι ἀ πολὺ τὸ μέσον· οὐ γὰρ οὐ δυτοὶ διάκονοι εἰσὶν ἀναδιδόμενοι, οὐ φρουτιδὸς τῆς Ἐκκλησίας. πολὺ γὰρ χεῖρον μᾶλλον ἀυτῷ ἀναβεβήκασι, οὐ τὰ μὲν ὁμοίως πλησίον τὰς πρεσβυτέρους. Homil. 11.

It is needlesse to repeat either the objection, or answer.

* But however this saying of S. *Hierome*, and the paralell of S. *Chrysostome* is but like an argument against an Evident truth, which comes forth upon a desperate service, and they are sure to be kill'd by the adverse party, or to runne upon their owne Swords; For either they are to be understood in the senses above explicated, and then they are impertinent, or else they contradict evidence of Scripture and Catholike antiquity, and so are false, and dye within their owne trenches.

I end this argument of tradition Apostolicall with that saying of *S. Hierome* in the same place. *Postquam Vnusquisq; eos quos baptizabat suos putabat esse, non Christi, & diceretur in populis, Ego sum Pauli, Ego Apollo, Ego autem Cephæ, in toto orbe decretum est ut Vnus de Presbyteris electus superponeretur cæteris, ut schismatum semina tollerentur.* That is, a publike *decree* issued out *in the Apostles times*, that in all Churches one should be chosen out of the Clergy, and set over them, *viz.* to rule and governe the flock commited to his charge. This I say was in the *Apostles* times, even upon the occasion of the *Corinthian* schisme, for then they said I am of *Paul*, and I of *Apollo*, and then it was, that he that baptized any Catechumens, tooke them for his owne not as *Christs* disciples. So that it was, *tempore Apostolorum*, that this *decree* was made, for in the time of the *Apostles* S. *Iames*, and S. *Marke*, and S. *Timothy*, and S. *Titus* were made *Bishops* by S. *Hieromes* expresse

attestation;

attestation; It was also [*toto orbe decretum*] so that if it had not beene proved to have beene an *immediate Divine institution*, yet it could not have gone much lesse, it being, as I have proved, and as S. *Hierome* acknowledges CATHOLIKE, and APOSTOLICK. *



§ 22. And all this hath beene the faith & practise of Christendome.

BEe *ye followers of me as I am of Christ*, is an *Apostolicall* precept. We have seene how the Apostles have followed Christ, how their tradition is consequent of Divine institution; Next let us see, how the Church hath followed the *Apostles*, as the *Apostles* have followed *Christ*. CATHOLIKE PRACTISE is the next Basis of the power and order of *Episcopacy*. And this shall be *in subsidium* to them also that call for reduction of the state Episcopall to a primitive consistence, and for the confirmation of all those pious sonnes of Holy Church, who have a venerable estimate of the publike and authoriz'd facts of Catholike Christendome.

* For Consider we, Is it imaginable, that all the world should immediately after the death of the Apostles conspire together to seek themselves, and not, *ea quæ sunt Iesu Christi*; to erect a government of their owne devising, not ordayn'd by Christ, not delivered by his *Apostles*, and to relinquish a *Divine foundation*, and the *Apostolicall* superstructure, which if it was at all, was a part of our Masters will, which whosoever knew, and observed not, was to be beaten with many stripes? Is it imaginable, that those gallant men who could not be brought off from the prescriptions of Gentilisme to the seeming impossibilities of Christianity, without evidence of Miracle, and clarity of Demonstration upon agreed principles, should all upon their first adhesion to Christianity, make an Universall dereliction of so considerable a part of their Masters will, and leave Gentilisme to destroy Christianity, for he that erects another Oeconomy then what the Master of the family hath ordayn'd, destroyes all those relations of mutuall dependance which Christ hath made for the coadunation of all the parts of it, and so destroyes it in the formality of a Christian congregation or family?

* Is it imaginable, that all those *glorious Martyrs*, that were so *curious observers of Divine Sanctions, and Canons Apostolicall*, that so long as that *ordinance* of the *Apostles* concerning abstinence from bloud was of force, they would rather dye then eat a strangled hen, or a pudding, (for so *Eusebius* relates of the Christians in the particular instance

stance of *Biblis* and *Blandina*) that they would be so sedulous in the contemning the *government* that *Christ left* for his family, and erect *another?*

* To what purpose were all their watchings, their banishments, their fears, their fastings, their penances and formidable austerities, and finally their so frequent *Martyrdomes*, of what excellency or availe, if after all, they should be hurried out of this world and all their fortunes and possessions, by untimely, by disgracefull, by dolourous deaths, to be set before a tribunall to give account of their universall neglect, and contemning of Christs last testament, in so great an affaire, as the whole government of his Church?

* If all Christendome should be guilty of so open, so united a defiance against their *Master*, by what argument, or confidence can any misbeliever be perswaded to *Christianity*, which in all its members for so many ages together is so unlike its first institution, as in its most publike affaire, and for matter of order of the most generall concernement, is so contrary to the first birth?

* Where are the promises of Christ's perpetuall assistance, of the impregnable permanence of the Church against the gates of Hell, of the Spirit of truth to lead it into all truth, if she be guilty of so grand an errour, as to erect a throne where Christ had made all levell, or appointed others to sit in it, then whom he suffers. * Either *Christ* hath left no *government*, or most certainly the Church hath retain'd that *Government* whatsoever it is, for the con-

contradictory to these would either make Christ improvident, or the *Catholick Church* extreamely negligent (to say no worse) and incurious of her *depositum*. * But upon the confidence of all * Christendome (if there were no more in it) I * suppose we may fairely venture. *Sit anima mea * cum Christianis.*

§ 23. Who first distinguished Names used before in common.

THE first thing done in *Christendome*, upon the death of the *Apostles* in this matter of *Episcopacy*, is the distinguishing of Names, which before were common. For in holy *Scripture* all the *names of Clericall offices* were given to the superiour order, and particularly all offices, and parts, and persons design'd in any imployment of the *sacred Preisthood*, were signified by *Presbyter* and *Presbyterium*. And therefore least the confusion of Names might perswade an identity and indistinction of office, the wisdome of H. Church found it necessary to distinguish and separate orders, and offices by distinct and proper appellations. [*For the Apostles did know by our Lord Iesus Christ that contentions would arise, ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματος τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς, about the name of Episcopacy,*] saith S. *Clement*, and so it did in the Church of *Corinth*, as soon as their *Apostle* had expired his last breath. But so it was.

Epist. ad Corinth.

1. The *Apostles*, which I have proved to be the supreame ordinary office in the Church, and to be succeeded in, we called in Scripture πρεσβύτεροι, *Elders* or *Presbyters*, πρεσβυτέρους τοὺς ἐν ὑμῖν παρακαλῶ ὁ συμπρεσβύτερος, saith S. *Peter the Apostle, the Elders,*

1. *Pet.* 5. 1.

or

or Presbyters that are among you, I also who am an Elder, or Presbyter doe intreat. Such elders S. *Peter* spoke to, as he was himselfe, to wit, those to whom the regiment of the Church was committed; the *Bishops of Asia, Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia,* and *Bithynia*, that is to *Timothy*, to *Titus*, to *Tychicus*, to *Sosipater*, to the *Angells* of the *Asian* Churches, and all others whom himselfe in the next words points out by the description of their office, ποιμάνατε τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν ποίμνιον τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐπισκοποῦντες, &c. *Feed the flock of God as Bishops, or being Bishops and overseers over it*; And that to rulers he then spake is evident by his μὴ καταχυριεύοντες, for it was impertinent to have warned them of tyranny, that had no rule at all. * The meere *Presbyters*, I deny not, but are included in this admonition; for as their office is involved in the *Bishops* office, the *Bishop* being *Bishop* and *Presbyter* too, so is his duty also in the *Bishops*; so that *pro ratâ* the *Presbyter* knowes what lies on him by proportion and intuition to the *Bishops* admonition. But againe. * ὁ πρεσβύτερος ἐκλεκτῇ κυρίᾳ, saith S. *Iohn* the Apostle; and, ὁ πρεσβύτερος Γαΐῳ τῷ ἀγαπητῷ. *The Presbyter to Gajus; the Presbyter to the elect Lady.*

2. * If *Apostles* be called *Presbyters*, no harme though *Bishops* be called so too, for *Apostles*, and *Bishops* are all one in ordinary office as I have proved formerly. Thus are those *Apostolicall* men in the Colledge at *Ierusalem* called *Presbyters*, whom yet the *Holy Ghost* calleth, ἄνδρας ἡγουμένους, *principall men, ruling men*, and οἱ καλῶς προεστῶτες πρεσβύτεροι, *the Presbyters that rule well.* By *Presbyters* are meant

Bishops, to whom only according to the intention, and exigence of *Divine institution* the *Apostle* had concredited the Church of *Ephesus*, and the neighbouring Citties, *ut solus quisq; Episcopus præsit omnibus*, as appears in the former discourse. The same also is *Acts* 20. The *Holy Ghost* hath made you *Bishops*, and yet the same men are called πρεσβύτερους τῆς Ἐκκλησίας. The one place expounds the other, for they are both *ad idem*, and speake of Elders of the same Church.

* 3. Although *Bishops* be called *Presbyters*, yet even in Scripture names are so distinguished, that meer *Presbyters* are never called *Bishops*, unlesse it be in conjunction with *Bishops*, and then in the Generall addresse, which, in all faire deportments, is made to the more eminent, sometimes *Presbyters* are, or may be comprehended. This observation if it prove true, will clearely show, that the confusion of names of *Episcopus*, and *Presbyter*, such as it is in Scripture, is of no pretence by any intimation of Scripture, for the indistinction of offices, for even the names in Scripture it selfe are so distinguished, that a meere *Presbyter* alone is never called a *Bishop*, but a *Bishop* an *Apostle* is often called a *Presbyter*, as in the instances above. But we will consider those places of Scripture, which use to be pretended in those impertinent arguings from the identity of Name, to confusion of things, and shew that they neither enterfere upon the maine Question, nor this observation. * *Paul and Timotheus to all the saints which are in Christ Iesus which are at Philippi, with the*

the Bishops and Deacons. I am willinger to choose this instance, because the place is of much consideration in the whole Question, and I shall take this occasion to cleare it from prejudice and disadvantage.

* By *Bishops* are here meant *Presbyters*, because
* many *Bishops* in a Church could not be, and yet
* S. *Paul* speaks plurally of the *Bishops* of the
* Church of *Philippi*, and therefore must meane
* meere *Presbyters* * so it is pretended.

1. Then; By [*Bishops*] are, or may be meant the whole superior order of the clergy, *Bishops* and *Priests*, and that he speaks plurally, he, may besides the *Bishops* in the Church, comprehend under their name the *Presbyters* too; for why may not the name be comprehended as well as the office, and order, the inferiour under the superiour, the lesser within the greater; for since the order of *Presbyters* is involved in the *Bishops* order, and is not only inclusively in it, but derivative from it; the same name may comprehend both persons, because it does comprehend the distinct offices and orders of them both. And in this sense it is (if it be at all) that *Presbyters* are sometimes in Scripture called *Bishops*.

* 2. Why may not [*Bishops*] be understood properly; For there is no necessity of admitting that there were any meere *Presbyters* at all at the first founding of this Church, It can neither be proved from Scripture, nor antiquity, if it were denyed: For indeed a *Bishop* or a company of *Episco-*

pall men as there were at *Antioch*, might doe all that *Presbyters* could, and much more. And considering that there are some necessities of a Church which a *Presbyter* cannot supply, and a *Bishop* can, it is more imaginable that there was no *Presbyter*, then that there was no *Bishop*. And certainely it is most unlikely, that what is not expressed, to wit, Presbyters should be onely meant, and that which is expressed should not be at all intended.

* 3. [*With the* Bishops] may be understood in the proper sense, and yet no more *Bishops* in one *Dioceſſe* then one, of a fixt residence; for in that sense is S. *Chrysostome* and the fathers to be understood in their commentaries on this place, affirming that one Church could have but one *Bishop*; but than take this along, that it was not then unusuall in such great Churches, to have many men who were temporary residentiaries, but of an *Apostolicall* and *Episcopall* authority, as in the Churches of *Ierusalem*, *Rome*, *Antioch*, there was as I have proved in the premises. Nay in *Philippi* it selfe, If I mistake not, as instance may be given, full, and home to this purpose. *Salutant te Episcopi Onesimus, Bitus, Demas, Polybius, & omnes qui sunt Philippis in Christo, unde & hæc vobis Scripsi*, saith *Ignatius* in his Epistle to *Hero* his Deacon. So that many *Bishops* (we see) might be at *Philippi*, and many were actually there long after S. *Paul's* dictate of the Epistle.

Τί οὖν; μίας πόλεως πολλοὶ Ἐπίσκοποι ὄντες; ἀδιαμόν. *Chrys. in* 1. *Phil.*

* 4. Why may not [*Bishops*] be meant in the proper sense? Because there could not be more *Bishops* then one, in a *Dioceſſe*. Not By what law? If by

by a conſtitution of the Church after the *Apoſtles* times, that hinders not, but it might be otherwiſe in the *Apoſtles* times. If by a Law in the *Apoſtles* times, then we have obtained the main queſtion by the ſhift, and the *Apoſtles* did ordain that there ſhould be one, and but one *Biſhop* in a Church, although it is evident they appointed many *Presbyters*. And then let this objection be admitted how it will, and doe its worſt, we are ſafe enough.

* 5. [*With the Biſhops*] may be taken diſtributively, for *Philippi* was a *Metropolis*, and had diverſe *Biſhopricks* under it, and S. *Paul* writing to the Church of *Philippi*, wrote alſo to all the daughter Churches within its circuit, and therefore might well ſalute many *Biſhops*, though writing to one *Metropolis*, and this is the more probable, if the reading of this place be accepted according to *Oecumenius*, for he reads it not σὺν ἐπισκόποις, but σωεπισκόποις, *Coepiſcopis, & Diaconis, Paul* and *Timothy to the Saints at Philippi, and to our fellow Biſhops.*

* 6. S. *Ambroſe* referres this clauſe of [*Cum Epiſcopis, & Diaconis,*] to S. *Paul* and S. *Timothy*, intimating that the benediction, and ſalutation was ſent to the Saints at *Philippi* from S. *Paul* and S. *Timothy* with the *Biſhops* and *Deacons*, ſo that the reading muſt be thus; *Paul, and Timothy with the Biſhops and Deacons, to all the Saints at Philippi* &c. *Cum Epiſcopis & Diaconis, hoc eſt, cum Paulo, & Timotheo, qui utiq; Epiſcopi erant, ſimul & ſignificavit Diaconos qui miniſtrabant ei. Ad plebem enim ſcribit. Nam ſi Epiſcopis ſcriberet, & Diaconi,* *In 1. Philip.*

ad personas eorum scriberet, & loci ipsius Episcopo scribendum erat, non duobus, vel tribus, sicut & ad Titum & Timotheum.

Pag. 54. *7. The like expression to this is in the Epistle of S. *Clement* to the *Corinthians*, which may give another light to this; speaking of the *Apostles*, καθιστάνοντες ἀπαρχὰς αὐτῶν εἰς Ἐπισκόπους, καὶ Διακόνους τῶν μελλόντων πιστεύειν. *They delivered their first fruits to the Bishops and Deacons.* *Bishops* here indeed may be taken distributively, and so will not inferre that many *Bishops* were collectively in any one Church, but yet this gives intimation for another exposition of this clause to the *Philippians*. For here either *Presbyters* are meant by Διακόνους, *Ministers*, or else *Presbyters* are not taken care of in the Ecclesiasticall provision, which no man imagines, of what interest soever he be; it followes then that [*Bishops and Deacons*] are no more but *Majores*, and *Minores Sacerdotes* in both places; for as *Presbyter*, and *Episcopus* were confounded, so also *Presbyter* and *Diaconus*; And I thinke it will easily be shewen in Scripture, that the word [*Diaconus*,] is given oftner to *Apostles*, and *Bishops*, and *Presbyters*, then to those ministers which now by way of appropriation we call *Deacons*. But of this anon. Now againe to the main observation.

1. Timoth. 3. * Thus also it was in the Church of *Ephesus*, for S. *Paul* writing to their *Bishop*, and giving order for the constitution and deportment of the Church orders and officers, gives directions first for *Bishops*, then for *Deacons*. Where are the *Presbyters* in the *interim*

interim? Either they must be comprehended in *Bishops* or in *Deacons*. They may as well be in one as the other; for [*Diaconus*] is not in Scripture any more appropriated to the inferiour Clergy, then *Episcopus* to the Superiour, nor so much neither. For *Episcopus* was never us'd in the *new Testament* for any, but such, as had the care, regiment, and supra-vision of a Church, but *Diaconus* was used generally for all Ministeries.

But yet supposing that *Presbyters* were included under the word *Episcopus*, yet it is not because the offices and orders are one, but because that the order of a *Presbyter* is comprehended within the dignity of a *Bishop*. And then indeed the compellation is of the more principall, and the *Presbyter* is also comprehended, for his conjunction, and involution in the Superiour, which was the principall observation here intended. *Nam in Episcopo omnes ordines sunt, quia primus Sacerdos est, hoc est, Princeps est Sacerdotum, & Propheta & Evangelista, & cætera ad-implenda officia Ecclesiæ in Ministerio Fidelium.* saith S. *Ambrose*. * So that if in the description of the qualifications of a *Bishop*, he intends to qualifie *Presbyters* also, then it is Principally intended for a *Bishop*, and of the *Presbyters* only by way of subordination and comprehension. This only by the way, because this place is also abused to other issues; To be sure it is but a vaine dreame that because *Presbyter* is not nam'd, that therefore it is all one with a *Bishop*, when as it may be comprehended under *Bishop* as a part in the whole, or the inferiour, within the superiour,

in Ephes. 4.

* *Idem ait S. Dionysius Eccles. hierarch. cap. 5.* ὁ δὲ τῆς ἱεραρχικῆς τάξεως ὁλόκληρος ὢν καὶ πάσης χάριτος θεαρχικῆς ὁλότελης μεταδοτικὸς, καὶ τάξιν τινὰ καὶ διάκοσμον ἱερᾶς τάξεως ἑνιαρχεῖ τοῖς τῆς οἰκείας ἱεραρχίας μυσταγωγοῖς.

superiour, (the office of a *Bishop* having in it the office of a *Presbyter* and something more) or else it may be as well intended in the word [*Deacons*,] and rather then the word, [*Bishop*] 1. Because [*Bishop*] is spoken of in the singular number, [*Deacons*] in the Plurall, and so liker to comprehend the multitude of *Presbyters*. 2. *Presbyters*, or else *Bishops*, and therefore much more *Presbyters*, are called by S. *Paul*, Διάκονοι. *Ministers*, *Deacons* is the word, διάκονοι δι' ὧν ἐπιστεύσατε, *Deacons by whose Ministration yee beleived*; and 3. By the same argument *Deacons* may be as well one with the *Bishop* too, for in the Epistle to *Titus*, S. *Paul* describes the office of a *Bishop*, and sayes not a word more either of *Presbyter* or *Deacons* office; and why I pray, may not the office of *Presbyters* in the Epistle to *Timothy* be omitted, as well as *Presbyters*, and *Deacons* too in that to *Titus*? or else why may not *Deacons* be confounded, and be all one with *Bishop*, as well as *Presbyter*? It will, it must be so, if this argument were any thing else but an aëry and impertinent nothing.

After all this yet, it cannot be showne in Scripture that any one single, and meere *Presbyter* is called a *Bishop*, but may be often found that a *Bishop*, nay an *Apostle* is called a *Presbyter*, as in the instances above, and therefore since this communication of Names is onely in descension, by reason of the involution, or comprehension of *Presbyter* within (*Episcopus*), but never in ascension, that is, an *Apostle*, or a *Bishop*, is often called *Presbyter*, and *Deacon*, and *Prophet*, and *Pastor*, and *Doctor*, but never

retrò,

retrò, that a meere *Deacon* or a meere *Presbyter*, should be called either *Bishop*, or *Apostle*, it can never be brought either to depresse the order of *Bishops* below their throne, or erect meere *Presbyters* above their stalls in the Quire. For we may as well confound *Apostle*, and *Deacon*, and with clearer probability, then *Episcopus*, and *Presbyter*. For *Apostles*, and *Bishops*, are in Scripture often called *Deacons*. I gave one instance of this before, but there are very many. εἰς διακονίαν ταύτην was said of S. *Matthias* when he succeded *Iudas* in the *Apostolate*. καλὸς ἔση διάκονος, said S. *Paul* to *Timothy* *Bishop of Ephesus*. S. *Paul* is called διάκονος τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης. 2 Cor. 6. 4. *A Deacon of the New Testament*, and διάκονοι δι' ὧν 1. Cor. 3. 5. ἐπιστεύσατε, is said of the first founders of the *Corinthian* Church; *Deacons by whom ye beleived*. *Paul* and *Apollos* were the men. It is the observation of S. *Chrysostome*, καὶ διάκονος, ἐπίσκοπος ἐλέγετο· διὰ τοῦτο γοῦν πρὸς Τιμόθεον ἔλεγε, τὴν διακονίαν σου πληροφόρησον, Ἐπισκόπην ὄντα. And a *Bishop* was called a *Deacon*, wherefore writing to *Timothy* he saith to him being a *Bishop*, *Fulfill thy Deaconship*. *in* 1. Philip:

* Adde to this, that there is no word, or designation of any Clericall office, but is given to *Bishops*, and *Apostles*. The *Apostles* are called [*Prophets*] *Acts* 13. *The Prophets at Antioch, were Lucius and Manaën, and* Paul *and* Barnabas; and then they are called [*Pastors*] too; and indeed, *hoc ipso* that they are *Bishops*, they are *Pastors*. *Spiritus* S. *posuit vos Episcopos* Pascere Ecclesiam Dei. Whereupon the Geeke Scholiast expounds the word [*Pastor*]

stors]to signifie *Bishops*, τὸν τὰς Ἐκκλησίας ἐμπιστευόμενον λέγει, διὸς ὁ Τιμόθεος διὸς ὁ Τίτος ἦν. And ever since that S. *Peter* set us a copie in the compellation of the Prototype calling him the *Great Sheapherd*, *and Bishop of our soules*, it hath obtayned in all antiquity, that *Pastors* and *Bishops* are coincident, and we shall very hardly meet with an instance to the contrary.

* If *Bishops* be *Pastors*, then they are *Doctors* also, for these are conjunct, when other offices which may in person be united, yet in themselves are made disparate; For [*God hath given some Apostles, some Prophets, some Evangelists, some* Pastors And Teachers.] ποιμένας καὶ διδασκάλους, If Pastors, then also Doctors, and Teachers. And this is observed by S. *Austin*. "*Pastors & Doctors whom you would* "*have me to distinguish, I think are one and the same.* For *Paul* doth not say; some *Pastors*, some *Doctors*, but to *Pastors* he joyneth *Doctors*, that *Pastors* might understand it belongeth to their office to teach. The same also is affirmed by *Sedulius* upon this place.

Ephes. 4.

Epist. 59. ad Paulinum.

Thus it was in Scripture; But after the Churches were setled & *Bishops* fix't upon their severall Sees, then the Names also were made distinct, only those names which did designe temporary offices did expire πάντως ἀκοινώνητον ὀνόματι saith S. *Chrysostome*, *Thus farre the names were common*, *viz.* in the sense above explicated, λοιπὸν ἤδη τὸ ἰδιάζον ἑκάστῳ ἀπονενέμηται ὀνομα, ἐπισκόπου ἐπισκόπῳ, πρεσβυτέρου πρεσβυτέρῳ. *But immediately the names were made proper and distinct, and to every order it's owne Name is left, of a Bishop to a Bishop, of a Presbyter to a Presbyter.* * This could not

not be suppos'd at first, for when they were to borrow words from the titles of secular honour, or offices, and to transplant them to an artificiall, and imposed sense; USE, which is the Master of language, must rule us in this affaire, and USE is not contracted but in some processe, and descent of time.* For at first, Christendome it selfe wanted a Name, and the *Disciples* of the Glorious Nazarene were *Christ'ned* first in *Antioch*, for they had their *baptisme* some yeares before they had their *Name*. It had been no wonder then, if *per omnia* it had so happened in the compellation of all the offices and orders of the Church.

§ 24. Appropriating the word *Episcopus* or Bishop to the Supreame Church-officer,

BVt immediately after the *Apostles*, and still more in descending ages *Episcopus* signified only the Superintendent of the Church, the *Bishop* in the present, & vulgar conception. Some few examples I shal give insteed of Myriads. In the Canons of the Apostles the word Ἐπίσκοπος, or *Bishop* is us'd 36 times in appropriation to him that is the *Ordinary Ruler* & *president* of the Church *above the Clergie and the Laity*, being 24 times expressely distinguish'd from *Presbyter*, and in the other 14 having particular care for government, jurisdiction, censures and Ordinations committed to him as I shall shew hereafter, and all this is within the verge of the first 50 which are received as Authentick, by the Councell of [a] *Nice*; of [b] *Antioch*, 25 Canons whereof are taken out of the Canons of the *Apostles*: the Councell of *Gangra* calling them *Canones Ecclesiasticos*, and *Apostolicas*

[a] *Can.* 15. & 16.
[b] *c.* 9. & *alibi.*

stolicas traditiones; by the Epistle of the first Councell of *Constantinople to Damasus*, which *Theodoret* hath inserted into his story; by the [c] Councell of *Epheſus*; by [d] *Tertullian*; by [e] *Constantine* the Great; and are sometimes by way of eminency called THE CANONS, sometimes, THE ECCLESIASTICALL CANONS, sometimes, the ancient and received Canons of our Fathers, sometimes the *Apostolicall Canons*, τὸς ὑπὸ τῶν πρὸ ἡμῶν ἁγίων καὶ μακαρίων πατέρων δεχθέντας καὶ κυρωθέντας, ἀλλὰ μὲν καὶ θεσμοθετήσαντες ἡμῖν ὀνόματι τῶν ἁγίων καὶ ἐνδόξων Ἀποστόλων, said the Fathers of the Councell in *Trullo*: and *Damascen* puts them in order next to the Canon of Holy Scripture: so in effect does *Isidore* in his preface to the worke of the Councells, for he sets these Canons in front, because *Sancti Patres eorum sententias authoritate Synodali roborarunt, & inter Canonicas posuerunt Constitutiones. The H. Fathers have established these Canons by the authority of Councells, and have put them amongst the Canonicall Constitutions.* And great reason, for in Pope *Stephens* time, they were translated into Latine by one *Dionysius* at the intreaty of *Laurentius*, because then the old Latine copies were rude and barbarous. Now then this second translation of them being made in Pope *Stephens* time, who was contemporary with S. *Irenæus* and S. *Cyprian*, the old copie, elder then this, and yet after the Originall to be sure, shewes them to be of prime antiquity, and they are mention'd by S. *Stephen* in an Epistle of his to Bishop *Hilarius*, where he is severe in censure of them who doe prevaricate these *Canons*.

c *post advent. Episc. Cypri.*
d *adverſ. Praxeam.*
e *lib. 3. c. 59. de vitâ Conſt.*
Ca. 4.
cap. 18. *de Orthod: fide*
Anno Dom. 257.

* But

* But for farther satisfaction I referre the Reader to the Epistle of *Gregory Holloander* to the Moderators of the Citie of *Norimberg*. I deny not but they are called *Apocryphall* by *Gratian*, and some others, *viz.* in the sense of the Church, just as the *wisdome of Solomon*, or *Ecclesiasticus*, but yet by most, beleived to be written by S. *Clement*, from the dictate of the Apostles, and without all Question, are so farre Canonicall, as to be of undoubted Ecclesiasticall authority, and of the first Antiquity.

Ignatius his testimony is next in time and in authority. Ἐπίσκοπος πάντων τύπος ὑπάρχει. *The Bishop bears the image and representment of the Father of all.* And a little after, τί γάρ ἐστιν ἐπίσκοπος, ἀλλ' ἢ πάσης ἀρχῆς, καὶ ἐξουσίας ἐπέκεινα πάντων κρατῶν; τὸ δὲ πρεσβυτέριον, ἀλλ' ἢ σύνταγμα ἱερεῖς, σύμβουλοι καὶ συνέδρια τοῦ Ἐπισκόπου; τί δὲ διάκονοι &c. *What is the Bishop, but he that hath all authority and rule? What is the Presbytery, but a sacred Colledge, Counsellors and helpers or assessors to the Bishop? what are Deacons* &c: So that here is the reall, and exact distinction of dignity, the appropriation of Name, and intimation of office. The *Bishop* is above all, the *Presbyters* his helpers, the *Deacons* his Ministers, μιμηταὶ τῶν Ἀγγελικῶν δυνάμεων, *imitators of the Angells who are Ministring Spirits.* But this is of so known, so evident a truth, that it were but impertinent to insist longer upon it. Himselfe in three of his Epistles uses it nine times in distinct enumeration, *viz.* to the *Trallians*, to the *Philadelphians*, to the *Philippians*. * And now I shall insert these considerations.

Epist. ad Trall.

1. Although it was so that *Episcopus*, and *Presbyter* were distinct in the beginning after the *Apostles* death, yet sometimes the names are used promiscuously, which is an evidence, that confusion of names is no intimation, much lesse an argument for the parity of offices, since themselves, who sometimes though indeed very seldome, confound the names, yet distinguish the offices frequently, and dogmatically. Μηδὲν ἄνευ τοῦ Ἐπισκόπου πράττε. ἱερεῖς ἐσμὲν, σὺ δὲ διάκονος τοῦ ἱερέως. Where by ἐπισκόπου, he means the *Presbyters* of the Church of *Antioch*, so indeed some say, and though there be no necessity of admitting this meaning, because by ἐπισκόπου he may mean the suffragan *Bishops of Syria*, yet the other may be fairely admitted, for himselfe the *Bishop* was absent from his Church, and had delegated to the *Presbytery* Episcopall jurisdiction to rule the Church till hee being dead another Bishop should be chosen, so that they were *Episcopi Vicarii*, and by representment of the person of the Bishop and execution of the Bishops power by delegation were called ἐπίσκοποι, and this was done least the Church should not be only without a Father, but without a Guardian too; & yet what a Bishop was, and of what authority no man more confident and frequent then *Ignatius*. * Another example of this is in *Eusebius*, speaking of the youth whom S. *John* had converted and commended to a Bishop. *Clemens*, whose story this was, proceeding in the relation saies, ὁ δὲ πρεσβύτερος &c. *But the Presbyter*; unlesse by πρεσβύτερος here S. *Clement* means not the

Epist. ad Heron.

Order

Order, but *age* of the Man, as it is like enough he did, for a little after, he calls him [ὁ πρεσβύτης] *The old man, Tum verò* PRESBYTER *in domum suam suscipit adolescentem. Redde depositum*, O EPISCOPE, saith S. *Iohn* to him. *Tunc graviter suspirans* SENIOR &c. So S. *Clement*. * But this, as it is very unusuall, so it is just as in Scripture, *viz.* in descent and comprehension, for this Bishop also was a *Presbyter*, as well as *Bishop*, or else in the delegation of Episcopall power, for so it is in the allegation of *Ignatius*.

2. That this name *Episcopus* or *Bishop* was chosen to be appropriate to the supreame order of the Clergy, was done with faire reason and designe. For this is no fastuous, or pompous title, the word is of no dignity, and implies none but what is consequent to the just and faire execution of its offices. But *Presbyter* is a name of dignity and veneration, *Rise up to the gray head*, and it transplants the honour and Reverence of age to the office of the *Presbyterate*. And yet this the *Bishops* left, and took that which signifies a meere supra-vision, and overlooking of his charge, so that if we take estimate from the names, *Presbyter* is a name of dignity, and *Episcopus*, of office and burden. * [*He that desires the office of a Bishop, desires a good work.*] ὁ ἐπιθυμῶν ἐπισκοπῆς καλοῦ ἔργου ἐπιθυμεῖ. Saith S. *Chrysostome*. *Nec dicit si quis Episcopatum desiderat, bonum desiderat gradum, sed bonum opus desiderat, quod in majore ordine constitutus posit si velit occasionem habere exercendarum virtutum*. So S. *Hierome*. It is not an honourable

ble title, but a good office, and a great opportunity of the exercise of excellent vertues. But for this we need no better testimony then of S. *Isidore*. *Episcopatus autem vocabulum inde dictum, quòd ille qui superefficitur superintendat, curam scil. gerens subditorum.* But, *Presbyter Græcè, latinè senior interpretatur, non pro ætate, vel decrepitâ senectute, sed propter honorem & dignitatem quam acceperunt.* ἔστιν δὲ πρεσβύτερον, ἀντὶ τοῦ, ἔστιν ὅτε τιμιώτερον· καὶ πρεσβεῖον τὸ τιμᾶν παρὰ πλάτωνι, saith *Iulius Pollux*.

Lib 7. etymolog. c. 12.

3. Supposing that *Episcopus* and *Presbyter* had been often confounded in Scripture, and Antiquity, and that, both in ascension and descension, yet as *Priests* may be called *Angells*, and yet the *Bishop* be THE ANGEL of the Church, [THE ANGEL,] for his excellency, [OF THE CHURCH,] for his appropriate preheminence, and singularity, so though *Presbyters* had been called *Bishops* in Scripture (of which there is not one example but in the senses above explicated, to wit, in conjunction and comprehension;) yet the Bishop is ὁ ἐπίσκοπος by way of eminence, THE BISHOP: and in descent of time, it came to passe, that the compellation, which was alwaies his, by way of eminence was made his by appropriation. And a faire precedent of it wee have from the compellation given to our blessed Saviour, ὁ μέγας ποίμην καὶ ἐπίσκοπος ψυχῶν, *The great Sheapheard, and Bishop of our soules.* The name [*Bishop*] was made sacred by being the appellative of his person, and by faire intimation it does more immediatly descend upon them, who had from Christ more

more immediate mission, and more ample power, and therefore [*Episcopus*] and [*Pastor*] by way of eminence are the most fit appellatives for them who in the Church have the greatest power, office and dignity, as participating of the fulnesse of that power and authority for which Christ was called the *Bishop of our soules*. * And besides this so faire a Copy; besides the useing of the word in the prophecy of the Apostolate of *Matthias*, and in the prophet *Isaiah*, and often in Scripture, as I have shown before; any one whereof is abundantly enough, for the fixing an appellative upon a Church officer; this name may also be intimated as a distinctive compellation of a Bishop over a Priest, because ἐπισκοπεῖν is indeed often used for the office of Bishops, as in the instances above, but σκοπεῖν is used for the office of the inferiours, for S. *Paul* writing to the *Romans*, who then had no Bishop fixed in the chaire of *Rome*, does command them σκοπεῖν τὲς τὰς διχοστασίας ποιῦντας: σκοπεῖν, not ἐπισκοπεῖν, this for the Bishop, that for the subordinate Clergy. So then, the word [*Episcopus*] is fixt at first, and that by derivation, and example of Scripture, and faire congruity of reason. Rom. 16. 17.

§ 25. Calling the Bishop and him only the Pastor of the Church,

BVt the Church used other appellatives for *Bishops*, which it is very requisite to specifie, that we may understand diverse authorities of the Fathers useing those words in appropriation to *Bishops*, which of late have bin given to *Presbyters*, ever since

since they have begun to set *Presbyters* in the roome of *Bishops*.

And first, Bishops were called [*Pastors*] in antiquity, in imitation of their being called so in Scripture. *Eusebius* writing the story of S. *Ignatius*, *Denique cùm Smyrnam venisset, ubi Polycarpus erat, scribit inde unam epistolam ad Ephesios, eorumque Pastorem*, that is, *Onesimus*, for so followes, *in quâ memininit Onesimi*. Now that *Onesimus* was their Bishop, himselfe witnesses in the Epistle here mentioned, πολυπήθειαν ὑμῶν ἐν ὀνόματι Θεοῦ ἀπείληφα ἐν Ονησίμῳ τῷ ἐπ' ἀγάπῃ ἀδιηγήτῳ ὑμῶν ὄντι ἐπισκόπῳ &c. *Onesimus* was their Bishop, and therefore their *Pastor*, and in his Epistle *ad Antiochenos* himselfe makes mention of *Evodius* Ἠ ἀξιομακαρίστου μιμένος ὑμῶν your most Blessed and worthy PASTOR.

lib. 3. hist. c. 36.

Epist. ad Ephes.

* When *Paulus Samosatenus* first broached his heresie against the divinity of our blessed Saviour, presently a Councell was called where S. *Denis* Bishop *of Alexandria* could not be present, *Cæteri veri Ecclesiarum* PASTORES *diversis è locis & urbibus .... convenerunt Antiochiam. In quibus insignes & cæteris præcellentes erant Firmilianus à Cæsareâ Cappadociæ, Gregorius, & Athenodorus Fratres ....& Helenus Sardensis* Ecclesiæ *Episcopus .... Sed & Maximus Bostrensis Episcopus dignus eorum consortio cohærebat.* These Bishops, *Firmilianus*, and *Helenus*, and *Maximus* were the PASTORS; and not only so, but *Presbyters* were not called PASTORS, for he proceedes, *sed & Prebyteri quamplurimi, & Diaconi ad supradictam Vrbem .... convenerunt*,

Euseb. lib. 7. cap. 24.

runt. So that these were not under the generall appellative of *Pastors.* * And the *Councell of Sardis* making provision for the manner of election of a *Bishop* to a Widdow-Church, when the people is urgent for the speedy institution of a *Bishop*, if any of the Comprovincialls be wanting he must be certifi'd by the Primate, ὅτι ἀξιοῖ τὰ πλήθη ποιμένα αὐτοῖς δοθῆναι, *that the multitude require a Pastor to be given vnto them.* * The same expression is also in the Epistle of *Iulius Bishop of Rome* to the *Presbyters, Deacons*, and People of *Alexandria* in behalfe of their *Bishop Athanasius*, *Suscipite itaq; Fratres charissimi cum omni divinâ gratiâ* PASTOREM VESTRUM AC PRÆSULEM *tanquam verè* ἀθανάσιον. And a litle after, *& gaudere fruentes orationibus qui* PASTOREM VESTRUM *esuritis & sititis* &c: The same is often us'd in S. *Hilary* and S. *Gregory Nazianzen*, where *Bishops* are called PASTORES MAGNI, *Great sheapheards*, or PASTORS; * When *Eusebius* the *Bishop of Samosata* was banished, *Vniversi lachrymis prosequuti sunt ereptionem* PASTORIS *sui*, saith *Theodoret*, *they wept for the losse of their* PASTOR. And *Eulogius* a *Presbyter* of *Edessa* when he was arguing with the Prefect in behalfe of Christianity, *&* PASTOREM (*inquit*) *habemus, & nutus illius sequimur, we have a* PASTOR (a Bishop certainely, for himselfe was a Priest) *and his commands we follow.* But, I need not specifie any more particular instances; I touch'd upon it before. * He that shall consider, that to *Bishops* the regiment of the whole Church was concredited at the first, and the *Presbyters* were

Can. 6.

hist. tripart. lib. 4. c. 29.

lib. 4. cap. 14.

Theodoret. lib. 4. c. 18.

but his assistants in Cities and Villages, and were admitted *in partem sollicitudinis*, first casually and cursorily, & then by station and fixt residency when Parishes were divided, and endowed, will easily see, that this word [*Pastor*] must needes be appropriated to *Bishops* to whom according to the conjunctive expression of S. *Peter*, and the practise of infant Christendome ἐπισκοπεῖν and ποιμαίνειν, was intrusted, first solely, then in communication with others, but alwaies principally.

But now of late, especially in those places where *Bishops* are exauctorated, and no where else, that I know, but amongst those men that have complying designes, the word [*Pastor*] is given to Parish Priests against the manner and usage of Ancient Christendome; and though Priests may be called *Pastors* in a limited, subordinate sense, and by way of participation (just as they may be called *Angels*, when the *Bishop* is *the Angell*, and so *Pastors* when the *Bishop* is *the Pastor*, and so they are called *Pastores ovium* in S. *Cyprian*) but never are they called *Pastores* simply, or *Pastores Ecclesiæ* for above 600 yeares in the Church, and I think 800 more. And therefore it was good counsell which S. *Paul* gave, to avoid *vocum Novitates*, because there is never any affectation of New words contrary to the Ancient voice of Christendome, but there is some designe in the thing too, to make an innovation: and of this we have had long warning, in the New use of the word [*Pastor*].

Epist. 11.

IF *Bishops* were the *Pastors*, then *Doctors* also; it was the observation which S. *Austin* made out of *Ephes.*4. as I quoted him even now, [*For God hath given some Apostles, some Prophets .... some Pastors and Doctors*]. So the Church hath learn'd to speak. In the Greeks Councell of *Carthage* it was decreed, that places which never had a Bishop of their owne should not now have καθηγητὴν ἴδιον, a DOCTOR of their owne, that is a *Bishop*, but still be subject to the Bishop of the Dioceſse to whom formerly they gave obedience; and the title of the chapter is, that the parts of the Dioceſse without the *Bishops* consent ἐπίσκοπον ἕτερον μὴ δέχεσθαι, must not have another *Bishop*. He who in the title is called *Bishop*, in the chapter is called the DOCTOR. And thus also, *Epiphanius* speaking of *Bishops* calleth them, πατέρας, καὶ διδασκάλους, *Fathers and* DOCTORS, *Gratia enim Ecclesiæ latus* DOCTORIS *est*, saith S. *Ambrose*, speaking of the eminence of the *Bishop*, over the *Presbyters* and subordinate Clergy. The same also is to be seen in S. * *Austin*, *Sedulius*, and diverse others. I deny not but it is in this appellative, as in diverse of the rest, that the *Presbyters* may in subordination be also called DOCTORS, for every *Presbyter* must be διδακτικὸς, apt to teach (but yet this is expressed as a requisite in the particular office of a *Bishop*) and no where expressely of a *Presbyter* that I can find in Scripture, but yet because in all Churches, it was by license of the *Bishop*, that *Presbyters* did Preach, if at all, and in some Churches the *Bishop* only did it,

§ 26. And Doctor.

*haeres.*75.

* *Epist* 59.

1. Tim. 3.

lib.7.c.19. particularly of *Alexandria* (Μόνος ὁ τῆς πόλεως Ἐπίσκοπος διδάσκει, saith *Sozomen*) therefore it was that the *Presbyter*, in the language of the Church was not, but the *Bishop*, was often called, DOCTOR of the Church.

§ 27. And Pontifex.

THe next word which the Primitive Church did use as proper to expresse the offices and eminence of *Bishops*, is PONTIFEX, and PONTIFICATUS for *Episcopacy*. *Sed à Domino edocti consequentiam rerum, Episcopis* PONTIFICATUS *munera assignavimus*, said the *Apostles*, as

1. lib.8.c.ult. Apost. constitut. S. *Clement* reports. PONTIFICALE πέταλον S. *Iohn* the Apostle wore in his forehead, as an Ensigne of his *Apostleship*, a gold plate or medall, when he was IN PONTIFICALIBUS, *in his pontificall or Apostolicall habit*, saith *Eusebius*.

2. lib.3.hist. cap.31. 2. * *De dispensationibus Ecclesiarum Antiqua sanctio tenuit & definitio SS. Patrum in Nicæâ convenientium .... & si* PONTIFICES *voluerint, ut cum eis vicini propter utilitatem celebrent ordinationes.* Said the Fathers of the Councell of

3. lib.9.c.14. hist.tripart. *Constantinople*. 3. * *Quâ tempestate in urbe Româ Clemens quoq; tertius post Paulum & Petrum*, Pos-

4 lib.3.c.21. TIFICATUM *tenebat*, saith 4 *Eusebius* according to the translation of *Ruffinus*. * *Apud Antiochiam verò Theophilus per idem tempus sextus ab Apostolis Ecclesiæ* PONTIFICATUM *tenebat*, saith the same

5. lib.4.c.20. *Eusebius*. 5. * And there is a famous story of *Alexander* Bishop *of Cappadocia*, that when *Narcissus* Bishop *of Ierusalem*, was invalid and unfit for government by reason of his extreame age, he was designed

designed by a particular Revelation and a voice from Heaven, *Suscipite Episcopum qui vobis à Deo destinatus est*; *Receive your Bishop whom God hath appointed for you*, but it was when *Narcissus jam senio fessus* PONTIFICATUS *Ministerio sufficere non posset*, saith the story. 6. * *Eulogius* the confessor discoursing with the Prefect, that wish'd him to comply with the Emperour, ask'd him; *Numquid ille unà cum Imperio etiam* PONTIFICATUM *est consequutus? He hath an Empire, but hath he also a Bishoprick?* PONTIFICATUS is the word. * But 7 S. *Dionysius* is very exact in the distinction of clericall offices, and particularly gives this account of the present. *Est igitur* PONTIFICATUS *ordo qui præditus vi perficiente munera hierarchiæ quæ perficiunt &c.* And a little after, *Sacerdotum autem ordo subjectus* PONTIFICUM *ordini &c.* To which agrees 8 S. *Isidore* in his etymologies, *Ideo autem & Presbyteri Sacerdotes vocantur, quia sacrum dant sicut &* Episcopi, *qui licet Sacerdotes sint, tamen* PONTIFICATUS *apicem non habent, quianec Chrismate frontem signant, nec Paracletum spiritum dant, quod solis deberi* Episcopis *lectio actuum Apostolicorum demonstrat*; and in the same chapter, PONTIFEX *Princeps Sacerdotum est.*

6. *Euseb. lib. 6. c 9.*

7. *Eccles. hierarch.*

8. *Lib 7. 12.*

One word more there is often used in antiquity for *Bishops*, and that's SACERDOS. *Sacerdotum autem bipartitus est ordo*, say S. *Clement* and *Anacletus*, for they are *Majores* and *Minores*. The *Majores*, *Bishops*, the *Minores*, *Presbyters*, for so it is in the Apostolicall Constitutions attributed to [a] S. *Clement*,

And *Sacerdos.*

a *Lib. 8. c. 46.*

Episcopis

Episcopis quidem assignavimus, & attribuimus quæ ad PRINCIPATUM SACERDOTII *pertinent, Presbyteris verò quæ ad Sacerdotium.* And in [b] *S. Cyprian, Presbyteri cum Episcopis Sacerdotali honore conjuncti.* But although in such distinction and subordination & in concretion a Presbyter is sometimes called *Sacerdos*, yet in Antiquity *Sacerdotium Ecclesiæ* does evermore signify *Episcopacy*, and *Sacerdos Ecclesiæ* the *Bishop*. *Theotecnus* SACERDOTIUM *Ecclesiæ tenens in Episcopatu*, saith [c] *Eusebius*, and *summus Sacerdos*, the Bishop alwaies, *Dandi baptismum jus habet summus* SACERDOS, *qui est Episcopus*, saith [d] *Tertullian*: and indeed *Sacerdos* alone is very seldome used in any respect but for the *Bishop*, unlesse when there is some distinctive terme, and of higher report given to the *Bishop* at the same time.

b Lib. 3. Ep. 1.

c Lib. 7. c. 28.

d Lib. de baptism.

Ecclesia est plebs SACERDOTI *adunata, & Grex pastori suo adhærens*, saith S. [e] *Cyprian*. And that we may know by [*Sacerdos*] he means the *Bishop*, his next words are, *Vnde scire debes Episcopum in Ecclesiâ esse, & Ecclesiam in Episcopo.* And in the same Epistle, *qui ad Cyprianum Episcopum in carcere literas direxerunt,* SACERDOTEM *Dei agnoscentes, & contestantes.* * [f] *Eusebius* reckoning some of the chief *Bishops* assembled in the Councell of *Antioch*, *in quibus erant Helenus Sardensis Ecclesiæ Episcopus, & Nicomas ab Iconio, & Hierosolymorum* PRÆCIPUUS SACERDOS *Hymenæus, & vicinæ huic urbis Cæsareæ Theotecnus*; and in the same place the *Bishops* of *Pontus* are called *Ponti provinciæ* SACERDOTES. *Abilius apud Alexandriam tredecem annis* SA-

e Epist. 69.

f Euseb. lib. 3. c. 21.

SACERDOTIO, *ministrato diem obiit*, for so long he was Bishop, *cui succedit Cerdon tertius in* SACERDOTIUM. *Et Papias similiter apud Hierapolim* SACERDOTIUM *gerens*, for he was *Bishop of Hierapolis* saith [g] *Eusebius*, and the [h] *Bishops* of the Province of *Arles*, speaking of their first *Bishop Trophimus*, ordained Bishop by S. *Peter*, say, *quod prima inter Gallias Arelatensis civitas missum à Beatissimo Petro Apostolo sanctum Trophimum habere meruit* SACERDOTEM. *** The Bishop also was ever design'd when ANTISTES *Ecclesiæ* was the word. *Melito quoq; Sardensis Ecclesiæ* ANTISTES, saith *Eusebius* out of *Irenæus*: ἐπίσκοπος is the name in Greeke, and used for the *Bishop* by *Iustin Martyr* (and is of the same authority and use with PRÆLATUS and *præpositus Ecclesiæ.*) ANTISTES *autem* SACERDOS *dictus, ab eo quod antestat. Primus est enim in ordine Ecclesiæ: & supra se nullum habet*, saith S. *Isidore*.

[g] *Lib. 3. c. 35.*
[h] *Epist. Comprovinc. ad S. Leonem.*
Lib. 4. c. 26.
Lib 7. Etymol c. 12.

*** But in those things which are of no Question, I need not insist. One title more I must specify to prevent misprision upon a mistake of theirs of a place in S. *Ambrose*. The *Bishop* is sometimes called PRIMUS PRESBYTER. *Nam & Timotheum Episcopum à se creatum Presbyterum vocat: quia* PRIMI PRESBYTERI *Episcopi appellabantur, ut recedente eo sequens ei succederet.* Elections were made of *Bishops* out of the Colledge of *Presbyters* (*Presbyteri unum ex se electum Episcopum nominabant*, saith S. *Hierome*) but at first this election was made not according to merit, but according to seniority, and therefore Bishops were called PRIMI PRESBYTERI,

Comment. in 4. Ephes.

Quæst. Vet. et N. Testam. Qu. 101.

RI, that's S. *Ambrose* his sense. But S. *Austin* gives another, PRIMI PRESBYTERI, that is chiefe above the Presbyters. *Quid est Episcopus nisi* PRIMUS PRESBYTER, *h. e. summus Sacerdos* (saith he) And S. *Ambrose* himselfe gives a better expositon of his words, then is intimated in that clause before, *Episcopi, & Presbyteri una ordinatio est? Uterq; enim Sacerdos est, sed Episcopus* PRIMUS *est, ut omnis Episcopus Presbyter sit, non omnis Presbyter Episcopus. Hic enim Episcopus est, qui inter Presbyteros* PRIMUS *est,* The bishop is PRIMUS PRESBYTER, that is, PRIMUS SACERDOS, *h. e.* PRINCEPS EST SACERDOTUM, so he expounds it, not *Princeps*, or *Primus* INTER PRESBYTEROS, himselfe remaining a meere *Presbyter*, but PRINCEPS PRESBYTERORUM; for PRIMUS PRESBYTER could not be *Episcopus* in another sense, he is the chiefe, not the senior of the *Presbyters*. Nay *Princeps Presbyterorum* is used in a sense lower then *Episcopus*; for *Theodoret* speaking of S. *Iohn Chrysostome*, saith, that having been the first *Presbyter* at *Antioch*, yet refused to be made *Bishop*, for a long time. *Iohannes enim qui diutissimi Princeps fuit Presbyterorum Antiochiæ, ac sæpe electus præsul perpetuus vitator dignitatis illius de hac admirabili solo pullulavit.*

In 1. *Tim.* 3.

In 4. *Ephes.*

*** The Church also in her first language when she spake of *Præpositus Ecclesiæ*, meant the *Bishop* of the *Dioceſſe*. Of this there are innumerable examples, but most plentifully in S. *Cyprian* in his 3, 4, 7, 11, 13, 15, 23, 27 Epistles; and in *Tertullian* his book *ad Martyres*; and infinite places more. Of which

which this advantage is to be made, that the Primitive Church did generally understand those places of Scripture which speak of *Prelates*, or *Præpositi*, to be meant of *Bishops*; *Obedite præpositis*, *Heb.* 13. saith S. *Paul*, *Obey your Prelates, or them that are set over you. Præpositi autem Pastores sunt*, saith S. *Austin*, *Prelates are they that are Pastors.* But S. *Cyprian* summes up many of them together, and insinuates the severall relations, expressed in the severall compellations of Bishops. For writing against *Florentius Pupianus*, *ac nisi* (saith he) *apud te purgati fuerimus .... ecce jam sex annis nec fraternitas habuerit Episcopum, nec plebs præpositum, nec grex Pastorem, nec Ecclesia gubernatorem, nec Christus antistitem, nec Deus Sacerdotes*; and all this he means of himselfe, who had then been sixe years Bishop of *Carthage*, a Prelate of the people, a governour to the Church, a Pastor to the flock, a Priest of the most high God, a Minister of Christ. *Epist.* 69.

The summe is this; When we find in antiquity any thing asserted of any order of the *hierarchy*, under the names of *Episcopus*, or *Princeps Sacerdotum*, or *Presbyterorum primus*, or *Pastor*, or *Doctor*, or *Pontifex*, or *Major*, or *Primus Sacerdos*, or *Sacerdotium Ecclesiæ habens*, or *Antistes Ecclesiæ*, or *Ecclesiæ sacerdos*; (unlesse there be a specification, and limiting of it to a parochiall, and inferior Minister) it must be understood of Bishops in its present acceptation. For these words are all by way of eminency, and most of them by absolute appropri-

ation, and singularity the appellations, and distinctive names of Bishops.

§ 28. And these were a distinct order from the rest.

BUT, ὀνόματα τῆς περιγιάτων μιμή ματα (saith the Philosopher) and this their distinction of Names did amongst the Fathers of the Primitive Church denote a distinction of calling, and office, supereminent to the rest.

For first *Bishops* are by all Antiquity reckoned as a distinct office of Clergy. *Si quis Presbyter, aut Diaconus, aut quilibet de Numero Clericorum ..., pergat ad alienam parochiam præter Episcopi sui con. scientiam*, &c. So it is in the fifteenth Canon of the *Apostles*, and so it is there plainly distinguished as an office different from Presbyter, and Deacon, above thirty times in those Canons, and distinct powers given to the Bishop, which are not given to the other, and to the Bishop above the other. * The Councell of *Ancyra* inflicting censures upon *Presbyters* first, then *Deacons* which had faln in time of persecution, gives leave to the Bishop to mitigate the paines as he sees cause. *Sed si ex Episcopis aliqui in iis vel afflictionem aliquam .... viderint, incorum potestate id esse.* The Canon would not suppose any Bishops to fall, for indeed they seldome did, but for the rest, provision was made both for their penances, and indulgence at the discretion of the Bishop. And yet sometimes they did fall, *Optatus* bewailes it, but withall gives evidence of their distinction of order. *Quid commemorem Laicos qui tunc in Ecclesiâ nullâ fuerant dignitate suffulti? Quid*

Can. 1. & 2.

Lib. 1. ad Parmen.

Quid Ministros plurimos, quid Diaconos in tertio, quid Presbyteros in secundo Sacerdotio constitutos? Ipsi apices, & Principes omnium aliqui Episcopi aliqua instrumenta Divinæ Legis impiè tradiderunt. The Laity, the Ministers, the Deacons, the Presbyters, nay the Bishops themselves, the Princes and chiefe of all, prov'd traditors. The diversity of order is here fairely intimated, but dogmatically affirmed by him in his 2d *book adv. Parmen. Quatuor genera capitum sunt in Ecclesiâ, Episcoporum, Presbyterorum, Diaconorum, & fidelium. There are foure sorts of heads in the Church, Bishops, Presbyters, Deacons, and the faithfull Laity.* And it was remarkable that when the people of *Hippo* had as it were by violence carried S. *Austin* to be made Priest by their Bishop *Valerius*, some seeing the good man weep in consideration of the great hazard and difficulty accruing to him in his ordination to such an office; thought he had wept because he was not Bishop, they pretending comfort told him, *quia locus Presbyterii licet ipse majore dignus esset appropinquaret tamen Episcopatui. The office of a Presbyter though indeed he deserv'd a greater, yet was the next step in order to a Bishoprick.* So *Possidonius* tells the story. It was the next step, the next in descent, in subordination, the next under it. So the Councell of *Chalcedon*, Ἐπίσκοπον εἰς πρεσβυτέρου βαθμὸν φέρειν ἱεροσυλία ἐστὶν. *It is sacriledge to bring downe a Bishop to the degree and order of a Presbyter,* ὥστε τῆς πρεσβύτερου ἐπισκοπῆς ὑποκεῖσθαι, so the Councell permits in case of great delinquency, to suspend him from the execution of his Episcopall

De vitâ August. c. 4.

Can. 29.

copall order, but still the character remaines, and the degree of it selfe is higher.

* *Nos autem idcirco hæc scribimus* (*Fratres chariß.*) *quia novimus quàm Sacrosanctum debeat esse* Episcopale *Sacerdotium, quod & clero, & plebi debet esse exemplo*, said the Fathers of the Councell of *Antioch*, in *Eusebius*, *The office of a Bishop is sacred, and exemplary both to the Clergy, and the People.* Lib. 7. c. 26.

Interdixit per omnia, Magna Synodus, *non* Episcopo, *non Presbytero, non Diacono licere, &c.* And it was a remarkable story that *Arius* troubled the Church for missing of a Prelation to the order and dignity of a *Bishop*. *Post Achillam enim Alexander .... ordinatur* Episcopus. *Hoc autem tempore Arius in ordine Presbyterorum fuit, Alexander was ordain'd a Bishop, and Arius still left in the order of meer Presbyters.* Can. 3. Nicen. Concil.

* Of the same exigence are all those clauses of commemoration of a Bishop and Presbyters of the same Church. *Iulius autem Romanus* Episcopus *propter senectutem defuit, erantq; pro eo præsentes Vitus, & Vincentius* Presbyteri *ejusdem* Ecclesiæ. They were his Vicars, and deputies for their Bishop in the *Nicene* Councell, saith *Sozomen*. But most pertinent is that of the *Indian* persecution related by the same man. Many of them were put to death. *Erant autem horum alii quidem* Episcopi, *alii* Presbyteri, *alii diversorum ordinum Clerici.* * And this difference of Order is cleare in the Epistle of the Bishops of *Illyricum* to the Bishops of the *Levant*, *De Episcopis autem constituendis, vel comministris jam constitutis si permanserint usq; ad* Lib. 2. c. 1. hist. tripart. Lib. 3. tripart. c. 2.

finem

finem sani, bene .... Similiter Presbyteros atq; Diaconos in Sacerdotali ordine definivimus, &c. And of *Sabbatius* it is said, *Nolens in suo ordine Manere Presbyteratus, desiderabat Episcopatum; he would not stay in the order of a Presbyter, but desir'd a Bishoprick. Ordo Episcoporum quadripartitus est, in Patriarchis, Archiepiscopis, Metropolitanis, & Episcopis*, saith S. *Isidore*; *Omnes autem superius designati ordines uno eodemq; vocabulo Episcopi Nominantur.* But it were infinite to reckon authorities, and clauses of exclusion for the three orders of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons; we cannot almost dip in any tome of the Councells but we shall find it recorded: And all the *Martyr Bishops* of *Rome* did ever acknowledge, and publish it, that Episcopacy is a peculiar office, and order in the Church of God; as is to be seen in their decretall Epistles, in the first tome of the Councells. * I onely summe this up with the attestation of the Church of England, in the preface to the book of ordination. *It is evident to all men diligently reading holy Scripture and Ancient Authors, that from the Apostles times, there have been these* ORDERS *of Ministers in Christs Church, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons.* The same thing exactly that was said in the second Councell of *Carthage*, τρεῖς βαθμοὺς τούτους, φημὶ δὴ, ἐπισκόπους, πρεσβυτέρους, καὶ διακόνους. But wee shall see it better, and by more reall probation, for that Bishops were a distinct order appears by this;

Hist. tripart. l.11.c.5.

Lib.7 etymol. c. 12.

Per Binium Paris.

Can 2.

1. The

§ 29. To which the Presbyterate was but a degree.

1. THe *Presbyterate* was but a step to *Episcopacy*, as *Deaconship* to the *Presbyterate*, and therefore the Councell of *Sardis* decreed, that no man should be ordain'd Bishop, but he that was first a *Reader*, and a *Deacon*, and a *Presbyter*, ἵνα κατ' ἔκαστον βαθμὸν ... εἰς τὴν ἀξίωσιν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς καὶ προκοπὴν διαβαίνῃ δωμεθείη; *That by every degree he may passe to the sublimity of Episcopacy.* ἔξεις δὲ ἑκάστου τάγματος ὁ βαθμὸς οὐκ ἐλαχίστου διανύσαι χρόνου μῆκος &c. *But the degree of every order must have the permanence and triall of no small time.* Here there is clearely a distinction of orders, and ordinations, and assumptions to them respectively, all of the same distance and consideration; And *Theodoret* out of the *Synodicall* Epistle of the same Councell, saies that they complain'd that some from *Arrianisme* were reconciled, and promoted from *Deacons* to be *Presbyters*, from *Presbyters* to be *Bishops*, calling it μείζονα βαθμὸν, a greater degree, or Order: And S. *Gregory Nazianz.* in his *Encomium* of S. *Athanasius*, speaking of his Canonicall Ordination, and election to a Bishoprick, saies that he was chosen being ἀξιάγαστος, most worthy, and πᾶσαν τὴν ἱερὰν βαθμῶν κολυμβήσαν διεξελθὼν, *coming through all the inferior Orders.* The same commendation S. *Cyprian* gives of *Cornelius. Non iste ad Episcopatum subito pervenit, sed per omnia Ecclesiastica officia promotus, & in divinis administrationibus Dominum sepè promeritus ad Sacerdotii sublime fastigium cunctis religionis gradibus ascendit .... & factus est Episcopus à plurimis Collegiis nostris qui tunc in Urbe*

Can. 10.

Lib. 5. c. 8.

Epist. 52.

Româ

Româ aderant, qui ad nos literas .... de ejus ordinatione miserunt. Here is evident, not only a promotion, but a new Ordination of S. *Cornelius* to be Bishop of *Rome*; so that now the chaire is full (saith S. *Cyprian*) *& quisquis jam Episcopus fieri voluerit foris fiat necesse est, nec habeat Ecclesiasticam ordinationem &c. No man else can receive ordination to the Bishoprick.*

§ 30.

2. THe ordination of a Bishop to his chaire was done *de Novo* after his being a *Presbyter*, and not only so, but in *another manner* then he had when he was made Priest. This is evident in the first Ecclesiasticall Canon that was made after Scripture. Ἐπίσκοπος χειροτονείσθω ὑπὸ Ἐπισκόπων δύο ἢ τριῶν. πρεσβύτερος ὑπὸ ἑνὸς Ἐπισκόπου χειροτονείσθω, καὶ διάκονος, καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ κληρικοί. *A Priest and Deacon must be ordain'd of one Bishop, but a Bishop must be ordain'd by two or three at least.* And that we may see it yet more to be *Apostolicall*, S. *Anacletus* in his second Epistle reports, *Hierosolymitarum primus Episcopus B. Iacobus à Petro, Iacobo, & Iohanne Apostolis est ordinatus.* Three Apostles went to the ordaining of S. *Iames* to be a Bishop, and the selfe same thing is in words affirmed by *Anicetus*; *ut in ore duorum, vel trium stet omnis veritas*; And S. *Cyprian* observes that when *Cornelius* was made Bishop of *Rome*, there hapned to be many of his fellow Bishops there, *& factus est Episcopus à plurimis collegis nostris qui tunc in urbe Româ aderant.* These *Collegæ* could not be meet Priests, for then the ordination of *Novatus* had

There being a peculiar manner of Ordination to a Bishoprick. *Can. Apost.* 1, & 2.

Epist. Vnica.

been more Canonicall, then that of *Cornelius*, and all Christendome had been deceived, for not *Novatus* who was ordain'd by three Bishops, but *Cornelius* had been the Schismatick, as being ordain'd by Priests, against the Canon. But here I observe it for the word [*plurimis*,] there were many of them ordination.

Can 4. * In pursuance of this *Apostolicall* ordinance, *Nicene* Fathers decreed that a *Bishop* should be ordayn'd, ὑπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐν τῇ παροικίᾳ *by all the Bishops in the Province*, unlesse it be in case of necessity, and then it must be done by three being gathered together, and the rest consenting; so the ordination to be performed. * The same is ratified in the Councell

Can. 19. of *Antioch*, ἐπίσκοπον μὴ χειροτονεῖσθαι, ἄνευ συνόδου, καὶ παρουσίας τῶν ἐν τῷ μητροπόλει τῆς ἐπαρχίας. A *Bishop* is not to be ordain'd without a *Synod* of *Bishops*, and the presence of the *Metropolitan* of the province. But if this cannot be done conviniently, yet however it is required μὴ τῆς τῶν πλειόνων παρουσίας, ἢ ψήφου γίνεσθαι πρὸς τὴν τάξιν, *the ordinations must be performed by many*. The same was decreed in the Councell of *Laodicea*, *can:* 12. in the 13. *Canon* of the *African Code*, in the

Can. 12. 22th *Canon* of the first Councell *of Arles*, and the fifth *Canon* of the second *Councell of Arles*, and was ever the practise of the Church; and so we may see it descend through the bowells of the fourth Coun-

Can. 4. cell of *Carthage* to the inferiour ages. *Episcopus quum ordinatur, duo Episcopi ponant, & teneant Evangeliorum codicem super caput, & cervicem ejus, & uno super eum fundente benedictionem, reliqui om-*

nes

nes Episcopi *qui adsunt manibus suis caput ejus tangant.*

The thing was Catholike, and Canonicall. It was *prima, & immutabilis constitutio*, so the first Canon of the Councel of *Epaunũ cals it; And therefore after the death of *Meletius Bishop of Antioch*, a schisme was made about his successor, & *Evagrius* his ordination condemn'd; because, *præter Ecclesiasticam regulam fuerit ordinatus, it was against the rule of Holy Church.* Why so? *Solus enim Paulinus eum instituerat plurimas regulas prævaricatus Ecclesiasticas. Non enim præcipiunt ut per se quilibet ordinare possit, sed convocare Universos provinciæ Sacerdotes, & præter tres Pontifices ordinationem penitùs fieri, interdicunt.* Which because it was not observ'd in the ordination of *Evagrius* who was not ordayn'd by three Bishops, the ordination was cassated in the Councell of *Rhegium.* And we read that when *Novatus* would faine be made a Bishop in the schisme against *Cornelius*, he did it *tribus adhibitis Episcopis* (saith *Eusebius*,) he obtain'd three *Bishops*, for performance of the action.

* A.D. 509.

Theodoret. l. 9. cap 44.

cap. 1. 2.

lib. 6. hist. cap. 33.

Now besides these Apostolicall, and Catholike Canons, and precedents, this thing according to the constant, and Vnited interpretation of the Greeke Fathers was actually done in the ordination of S. *Timothy* to the Bishoprick of *Ephesus.* [*Neglect not the grace that is in thee by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery.*] The Latine Fathers expound it abstractly, *viz.* to signifie the office of Priest-hood, that is, neglect not the grace of Priest-hood that is

in thee by the imposition of hands, and this *Erasmus* helpes by making [*Presbyterij*] to pertaine to [*Gratiam*] by a new inter-punction of the words; but however, *Presbyterij* with the Latine Fathers signifies *Presbyteratûs*, not *Presbyterorum*, and this *Presbyteratus* is in their sense used for *Episcopatus* too. But the Greeke Fathers understand it collectively, and πρεσβυτεῖα is put for πρεσβυτέρων, not simply such, but *Bishops* too, all agree in that, that *Episcopacy* is either meant in office, or in person. πρεσβυτέρους τοὺς Ἐπισκόπους φησίν. So *Oecumenius*; and S. *Chrysostome*, ὁ περὶ πρεσβυτέρων φησὶν ἐνταῦθα, ἀλλὰ περὶ ἐπισκόπων. So *Theophilact*, So *Theodoret*. The probation of this lies upon right reason, and Catholicke tradition; For,

§ 31. To which Presbyters never did assist by imposing hands,

3. THE *Bishops* ordination was peculiar in this respect above the *Presbyters*, for a *Presbyter* did never impose hands on a Bishop. On a *Presbyter* they did ever since the fourth Councell of *Carthage*; but never on a Bishop. And that was the reason of the former exposition. By the *Presbytery* S. *Paul* meanes Bishops, ὁ γὰρ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ἐχειροτόνησαν ἢ Ἐπίσκοπον. *Presbyters did not impose hands on a Bishop*, and therefore *Presbyterium* is not a Colledge of meere *Presbyters*, for such could never ordaine S. *Timothy* to be a *Bishop*. The same reason is given by the Latine Fathers why they expound *Presbyterium* to signifie *Episcopacy*. For (saith S. *Ambrose*) S. *Paul* had ordain'd *Timothy* to be a *Bishop*, *Vnde & quemadmodum Episcopum ordinet ostendit.*

ostendit. Neq; enim fas erat, aut licebat, ut inferior ordinaret Majorem. So he; and subjoynes this reason, *Nemo n. tribuit quod non accepit.* The same is affirmed by S. *Chrysostome*, and generally by the authors of the former expositions, that is, the Fathers both of the *East*, and *West*. For it was so Generall and Catholike a truth, that *Priests* could not, might not lay hands on a *Bishop*, that there was never any example of it in Christendome till almost 600 yeares after Christ, and that but once, and that irregular, and that without imitation in his Successors, or example in his Antecessors. It was the case of *Pope Pelagius* the first, *& dum non essent Episcopi, qui eum ordinarent, inventi sunt duo Episcopi, Iohannes de Perusio, & Bonus de Ferentino, & Andræas Presbyter de Ostiâ, & ordinaverunt eum Pontificem. Tunc enim non erant in Clero qui eum posſent promovere.* Saith *Damasus*. It was in case of necessity, because there were not three Bishops, therefore he procur'd two, and a Priest of *Ostia* to supply the place of the third, that three, according to the direction *Apostolicall*, and Canons of *Nice*, *Antioch*, and *Carthage*, make Episcopall ordination. * The Church of *Rome* is concern'd in the businesse to make faire this ordination, and to reconcile it to the Councell of *Rhegium*, and the others before mentined, who if ask't would declare it to be invalid. * But certainly as the Canons did command three to impose hands on a *Bishop*, so also they commanded that those three, should be three *Bishops*, and *Pelagius* might as well not have had three, as not

A.D. 555.

in libr. Pontificali. vit. Pelag. 1.

three *Bishops*; and better, because, so they were *Bishops* the first Canon of the *Apostles*, approves the ordination if done by two, ἐπισκόπων δύο, ἢ τριῶν. And the *Nicene Canon* is as much exact, in requirng the capacity of the person, as the Number of the Ordainers. But let them answer it. For my part, I beleive that the imposition of hands by *Andreas*, was no more in that case then if a lay man had done it; it was χεὶρ ἄκυρος, and though the ordination was absolutely Un-canonicall, yet it being in the exigence of Necessity, and being done by two Bishops according to the Apostolicall Canon, it was valid *in naturâ rei*, though not *in formâ Canonis*, and the addition of the Priest was but to cheate the Canon, and cozen himselfe into an impertinent beleife of a Canonicall ordination. Can. 6. Concil. Sardic. Ἐπίσκοποι Ἐπισκόπους χειροτονεῖν ὀφείλουσιν, saith the Councell of *Sardis*. *Bishops* must ordaine *Bishops*; It was never heard that Priests did, or *de jure* might.

These premises doe most certainely inferre a reall difference, between Episcopacy, and the Presbyterate. But whether or no they inferre a differenece of order, or onely of degree; or whether degree, and order be all one, or no, is of great consideration in the present, and in relation to many other Questions.

1. Then it is evident, that in all Antiquity, *Ordo*, and *Gradus* were us'd promiscuously. [βαθμὸς] was the Greeke word, and for it the Latins us'd [*Ordo*] as is evident in the instances above mention'd, to which, adde, that *Anacletus* sayes, that Epist. 3. Christ

Christ did *instituere duos Ordines, Episcoporum, & Sacerdotum.* And S. *Leo* affirmes; *Primum ordinem esse* Episcopalem, *secundum Presbyteralem, tertium Leviticum*; And these among the Greekes are call'd τρεῖς βαθμοὶ, three *degrees.* So the order of *Deaconship* in S. *Paul* is called καλὸς βαθμὸς, *a good degree*; and βαθμὸν ἐκτήσωνται, &c: is a censure us'd alike in the censures of *Bishops, Priests,* and *Deacons.* They are all of the same Name, and the same consideration, for *order, distance,* and *degree,* amongst the Fathers; *Gradus,* and *ordo* are equally affirm'd of them all; and the word *gradus* is us'd sometimes for that which is called *Ordo* most frequently. So *Felix* writing to S. *Austin, Non tantùm ego posum contrà tuam virtutem, quia mira virtus est* GRADUS EPISCOPALIS; and S. *Cyprian* of *Cornelius, Ad Sacerdotij sublime fastigium cunctis religionis* GRADIBUS *ascendit. Degree,* and *Order,* are us'd in common, for he that speaks most properly will call that an *Order* in persons, which corresponds to a *degree* in qualities, and neither of the words are wrong'd by a mutuall substitution.

Epist. 84 c. 4.

Lib. 1 c. 12. de actis cum Felice Manich.

lib 4. Epist. 2.

2. The promotion of a *Bishop ad Munus Episcopale,* was at first call'd *ordinatio Episcopi. Stirre up the Grace that is in the,* juxta ORDINATIONEM *tuam in* Episcopatum, saith *Sedulius*; And S. *Hierome*; *Prophetiæ gratiam habebat cum* ORDINATIONE *Episcopatûs.* *. *Neq; enim fas erat aut licebat ut inferior* ORDINARET *majorem,* saith S. *Ambrose,* proving that *Presbyters* might not impose hands on a *Bishop.* * *Romanorum Ecclesia Clementem à Petro*

in 1. Tim. 3.

tro ORDINATUM *edit*, saith *Tertullian*; and S. *Hie-*
de præscript. cap. 32. *rome* affirmes that S. *Iames* was ORDAIND *Bishop of Ierusalem* immediately after the Passion of our Lord. [*Ordinatus*] was the word at first, and afterwards [CONSECRATUS] came in conjunction with it, When *Moses* the Monke was to be ordain'd, to wit, a *Bishop*, for that's the title of the story in *Theodoret*, and spyed that *Lucius* was there ready to
lib. 4. cap. 23. impose hands on him, *absit* (saies he) *vt manus tua me* CONSECRET.

3. In all orders, there is the impresse of a distinct Character; that is, the person is qualified with a new capacity to doe certaine offices, which before his ordination he had no power to doe. A Deacon hath an order or power

——— *Quo pocula vitæ*
Misceat, & latices, cum Sanguine porrigat agni,

as *Arator* himselfe a Deacon expresses it. *A Presbyter* hath an higher *order*, or *degree* in the office or ministery of the Church, whereby he is enabled, προσφέρειν, ὁμιλεῖν, καὶ λειτουργεῖν τὰ περὶ ἱερατικῶν λειτουργιῶν, as the Councell of *Ancyra* does intimate. But a *Bi-*
cap. 1. *shop* hath a higher yet; for besides all the offices communicated to *Priests*, and *Deacons*; he can give *orders*, which very one thing makes *Episcopacy* to be a distinct *order*. For, *Ordo*, is definid by the Schooles to be, *traditio potestatis spiritualis, & collatio gratiæ, ad obeunda Ministeria Ecclesiastica*; *a giving a spirituall power, and a conferring grace for the performance of Ecclesiasticall Ministrations*. Since then *Episcopacy* hath a new *ordination*, and a distinct *power* (as I shall

shall shew in the descent) it must needs be a distinct *order*, both according to the Name given it by antiquity, and according to the nature of the thing in the definitions of the Schoole.

There is nothing said against this but a fancy of some of the Church of *Rome*, obtruded indeed upon no grounds; for they would define order to be *a speciall power in relation to the Holy Sacrament*, which they call *corpus Christi naturale*; and *Episcopacy* indeed to be a distinct power in relation *ad corpus Christi Mysticum*, or the regiment of the Church, and ordayning labourers for the harvest, and therefore not to be a distinct order.

But this to them that consider things sadly, is true or false according as any man list. For if these men are resolved they will call nothing an *order* but what is a *power* in order to consecration of the Eucharist, who can help it? Then indeed, in that sense, *Episcopacy* is not a distinct order, that is, a *Bishop* hath no new power in the consecration of the Venerable Eucharist, more then a *Presbyter* hath. But then why these men should only call this power [*an order*] no man can give a reason. For, 1. in Antiquity the distinct power of a Bishop was ever called an Order, and I think, before *Hugo de* S. *Victore*, and the *Master of the Sentences*, no man ever deni'd it to be an *order*. 2. According to this rate, I would faine know how the office of a *Sub-deacon*, and of an *Ostiary*, and of an *Acolouthite*, and of a *Reader*, come to be distinct *Orders*; for surely the *Bishop* hath as much power in order to consecration *de Novo*, as

they have *de integro*. And if I mistake not; that the *Bishop* hath a new power to ordaine *Presbyters* who shall have a power of consecrating the Eucharist, is more a new power in order to consecration, then all those inferiour officers put together have in all, and yet they call them Orders, and therefore why not *Episcopacy* also, I cannot imagine, unlesse because they will not.

*** But however in the meane time, the denying the office and degree of Episcopacy to be a new and a distinct order is an Innovation of the production of some in the Church of *Rome*, without all reason, and against all antiquity. This onely by the way.

The Enemies of *Episcopacy* call in aide from all places for support of their ruinous cause, and therefore take their maine hopes from the Church of *Rome* by advantage of the former discourse. For since (say they) that consecration of the Sacrament is the Greatest worke, of the most secret mystery, greatest power, and highest dignity that is competent to man, and this a *Presbyter* hath as well as a *Bishop*, is it likely that a *Bishop* should by *Divine institution* be so much Superiour to a *Presbyter*, who by the confession of all sides communicates with a *Bishop* in that which is his highest power? And shall issues of a lesser dignity distinguish the *Orders*, and make a *Bishop* higher to a *Presbyter*, and not rather the Greater raise up a *Presbyter* to the Counter-poise of a *Bishop*? Upon this surmise the *men of the Church of Rome*, would inferre an identity of *order*,

S. *Hieron: ad Rusticum Narbonens: apud Gratian. dist: 95. can: ecce ego. casus, ibid.*

der, though a disparity of *degree*, but the *Men of the other world* would inferre a parity both of order and degree too. The first are already answered in the premises. The second must now be serv'd.

1. Then, whether power be greater, of *Ordaining* Priests, or *Consecrating* the Sacrament is an impertinent Question; possibly, it may be of some danger; because in comparing Gods ordinances, there must certainely be a depression of one, and whether that lights upon the right side or no, yet peradventure it will not stand with the consequence of our gratitude to God, to doe that, which in Gods estimate, may tant' amount to a direct Undervaluing; but however it is vnprofitable, of no use in case of conscience either in order to faith, or manners, and besides, cannot fixe it selfe upon any basis, there being no way of proving either to be more excellent then the other.

2. The Sacraments, and mysteries of Christianity if compared among themselves, are greater, and lesser in severall respects. For since they are all in order to severall ends, that is, productive of severall effects, and they all are excellent, every rite, and sacrament in respect of its own effect, is more excellent then the other not ordain'd to that effect. For example. Matrimony is ordain'd for a means to preserve chastity, and to represent the mysticall union of Christ and his Church, and therefore in these respects is greater then baptisme, which does neither. But * baptisme is for remission of sinnes and in that is more excellent then Matrimony; the

* The Nicene Creed.

same may be said for ordination, and consecration, the one being in order to Christs naturall body (as the Schooles speak) the other in order to his mysticall body, and so have their severall excellencies respectively; but for an absolute preheminence of one above the other, I said there was no *basis* to fixe that upon, and I believe all men will find it so that please to try. But in a relative, or respective excellency, they goe both before, and after one another. Thus Wooll, and a Iewell, are better then each other; for wooll is better for warmth, and a jewell for ornament. A frogge hath more sense in it, then the Sunne; and yet the Sunne shines brighter.

3. Suppose *consecration* of the Eucharist were greater then *ordaining Priests*, yet that cannot hinder, but that the *power of ordaining* may make a *higher and distinct order*, because the power of ordaining, hath in it the power of consecrating and something more; it is all that which makes the *Priest*, and it is something more besides, which makes the *Bishop*. Indeed if the Bishop had it not, and the Priest had it, then supposing consecration to be greater then ordination, the Priest would not only equall, but excell the Bishop, but because the Bishop hath that, and ordination besides, therefore he is higher both in Order, and Dignity.

4. Suppose that *Consecration* were the greatest Clericall power in the world, and that the Bishop, and the Priest, were equall in the greatest power, yet a lesser power then it, superadded to the Bishop's, may make a distinct *order*, and superiority.

Thus

Thus it was said of the sonne of Man. *Constituit eum paulò minorem Angelis, he was made a little lower then the Angels.* It was but a little lower, and yet so much as to distinguish their Natures, for he took not upon him the NATURE *of Angells, but the seed of Abraham.* So it is in proportion between Bishop, and Priest; for though a Priest communicating in the greatest power of the Church, *viz. consecration* of the venerable Eucharist, yet differing in a lesse is *paulò minor Angelis, a little lower then the* Bishop, *the Angell of the Church*, yet this little lower, makes a distinct order, and enough for a subordination. * An Angell, and a man communicate in those great excellencies of spirituall essence, they both discourse, they have both election, and freedome of choice, they have will, and understanding, and memory, impresses of the Divine image, and loco-motion, and immortality. And these excellencies are (being precisely considered) of more reall and eternall worth, then the Angelicall manner of moving so in an instant, and those other formes and modalities of their knowledge and volition, and yet for these superadded parts of excellency, the difference is no lesse then specificall. If we compare a Bishop and a Priest thus, what we call difference in nature there, will be a difference in order here, and of the same consideration.

5. Lastly it is considerable, that these men that make this objection, doe not make it because they think it true, but because it will serve a present turne. For all the world sees, that to them that deny the

reall presence, this can be no objection; and most certainly the *Anti-episcopall* men doe so, in all senses; and then what excellency is there in the power of consecration, more then in ordination? Nay is there any such thing as consecration at all? This also would be considered from their principles. But I proceed.

One thing only more is objected against the maine Question. If *Episcopacy* be a distinct order, why may not a man be a Bishop that never was a Priest, as (abstracting from the lawes of the Church) a man may be a Presbyter that never was a Deacon, for if it be the impresse of a distinct character, it may be imprinted *per saltum*, and independantly, as it is in the order of a Presbyter.

To this I answere, It is true if the powers and characters themselves were independant, as it is in all those offices of humane constitution, which are called the inferior orders; For the office of an *Acolouthite*, of an *Exorcist*, of an *Ostiary*, are no way dependant on the office of a *Deacon*, and therefore a man may be Deacon, that never was in any of those, and perhaps a *Presbyter* too, that never was a *Deacon*, as it was in the first example of the *Presbyterate* in the 72. *Disciples*. But a *Bishop* though he have a distinct character, yet it is not disparate from that of a *Presbyter*, but supposes it *ex vi ordinis*. For since the power of ordination (if any thing be) is the distinct capacity of a *Bishop*, this power supposes a power of *consecrating* the Eucharist to be in the *Bishop*, for how else can he ordaine a *Presbyter* with

with a power, that himselfe hath not? can he give, what himselfe hath not received?

* I end this point with the saying of *Epiphanius*, *Vox est Aërii haretici unus est ordo Episcoporum, & Presbyterorum, una dignitas.* To say that *Bishops* are not a distinct order from *Presbyters*, was a heresy first broach'd by *Aërius*, and hath lately been (at least in the manner of speaking) countenanc'd by many of the Church of *Rome*. *Haeres 75.*

§ 32.

For Bishops had a power distinct, and Superiour to that of Presbyters.

As of Ordination.

FOR to cleare the distinction of order, it is evident in Antiquity, that Bishops had a power of imposing hands, for collating of Orders, which Presbyters have not. * What was done in this affaire in the times of the Apostles I have already explicated; but now the inquiry is, what the Church did in pursuance of the *practise*, and *tradition Apostolicall*. The first, and second Canons of the *Apostles* command that two, or three Bishops should ordaine a Bishop, and one Bishop should ordaine a Priest, and a Deacon. A *Presbyter* is not authorized to ordaine, a Bishop is. * S. *Dionysius* affirmes, *Sacerdotem non posse initiari, nisi per invocationes Episcopales*, and acknowledges no ordainer but a Bishop. No more did the Church ever; Insomuch that when *Novatus* the Father of the old Puritans, did *ambire Episcopatum*, he was faine to goe to the utmost parts of *Italy*, and seduce or intreat some Bishops to impose hands on him, as *Cornelius* witnesses in his Epistle to *Fabianus*, in *Eusebius*. * To this we may adde as so many witnesses, all those ordinations *Eccles. hier. c. 5.* *Lib. 6. cap. 33.*

dinations made by the *Bishops of Rome*, mentioned in the Pontificall book of *Damasus*, *Platina*, and others. *Habitis de more sacris ordinibus Decembris mense, Presbyteros decem, Diaconos duos, &c. creat* (*S. Clemens*) *Anacletus Presbyteros quinq;, Diaconos tres, Episcopos diversis in locis sex numero creavit*, and so in descent, for all the Bishops of that succession for many ages together.

But let us see how this power of ordination went in the Bishops hand alone, by Law and Constitution; for particular examples are infinite.

Can. 13. In the Councell of *Ancyra* it is determin'd χωρεπισκόπους μὴ ἐξεῖναι πρεσβυτέρους ἢ διακόνους χειροτονεῖν· ἀλλὰ μὴν πρωτοκαθεδρίας πόλεως, χώρεις δὲ ἐπιτραπῶσι ὑπὸ τῆς Ἐπισκόπου γράμματα ἐν ἑτέρᾳ παροικίᾳ. That *Rurall Bishops* shall not ordaine *Presbyters* or *Deacons* in anothers *diocesse* without letters of license from the *Bishop*. Neither shall the *Priests* of the City attempt it. * First not Rurall Bishops, that is, Bishops that are taken *in adjutorium Episcopi Principalis*, Vicars to the *Bishop* of the diocesse, they must not ordaine *Priests* and *Deacons*. For it is ἑτέρᾳ παροικίᾳ, *It is anothers diocesse*, and to be ἀλλοτριεπισκοπεῖν, is prohibited by the Canon of Scripture. But then they may with license? Yes; for they had *Episcopall* Ordination at first, but not *Episcopall* Iurisdiction, and so were not to invade the territories of their neighbour. The tenth Canon of the Councell of Antioch clears this part. The words are these as they are rendred by *Dionysius Exiguus*. *Qui in villis, & vicis constituti sunt Chorepiscopi tametsi manûs impositionem*

tionem ab Episcopis susceperunt, [*& ut Episcopi sunt consecrati*] *tamen oportet eos modum proprium retinere, &c.* εἰ καὶ χειροθεσίαν εἶεν ἐπισκόπων εἰληφότες, the next clause [*& ut Episcopi consecrati sunt*] although it be in very ancient Latine copies, yet is not found in the Greek, but is an *assumentum* for exposition of the Greek, but is most certainly implyed in it; for else, what description could this be of *Chorepiscopi*, above *Presbyteri rurales*, to say that they were χειροθεσίαν ἐπισκόπων εἰληφότες, for so had country Priests, they had received imposition of the *Bishops* hands. Either then the *Chorepiscopi* had received ordination from three *Bishops*, and ἐπισκόπων is to be taken collectively, not distributively, to wit, that each Country *Bishop* had received ordination from *Bishops*, many *Bishops* in conjunction, and so they were very *Bishops*, or else they had no more then Village *Priests*, and then this caution had been impertinent.

* But the City *Priests* were also included in this prohibition. True it is, but it is in a *Parenthesis*, with an ἀλλὰ μηδὲ, in the midst of the Canon, and there was some particular reason for the involving them, not that they ever did actually ordaine any, but that since it was prohibited to the *chorepiscopi* to ordaine (to them I say who though for want of jurisdiction they might not ordaine without license, it being *in alienâ Parochiâ*, yet they had capacity by their order to doe it) if these should doe it, the Citty *Presbyters* who were often dispatch'd into the Villages upon the same imployment, by a

temporary mission, that the *Chorepiscopi* were by an ordinary, and fixt residence might perhaps think that their commission might extend farther then it did, or that they might goe beyond it, as well as the *Chorepiscopi*, and therefore their way was obstructed by this clause of ἀλλὰ μηδὲ πρεσβυτέρους πόλεως. * Adde to this; The *Presbyters* of the City were of great honour, and peculiar priviledge, as appeares in the thirteenth Canon of the Councell of *Neo-Cæsarea*, and therefore might easily exceed, if the Canon had not beene their bridle.

The summe of the Canon is this. With the *Bishops* licence the *Chorepiscopi* might ordaine, for themselves had *Episcopall ordination*, but without licence they might not, for they had but delegate, and subordinate jurisdiction; And therefore in the *fourteenth Canon* of *Neo-Cæsarea* are said to be εἰς τόπον τῶν ἑβδομήκοντα, like the 70 *Disciples*, that is, inferior to *Bishops*, and the 70 were to the *twelve Apostles*, *viz. in hoc particulari*, not in order, but like them in subordination and inferiority of jurisdiction: but the Citty *Presbyters* might not ordaine, neither with, nor without licence; for they are in the Canon only by way of parenthesis, and the sequence of procuring a faculty from the *Bishops* to collate orders, is to be referred to *Chorepiscopi*, not to *Presbyteri Civitatis*, unlesse we should straine this Canon into a sense contrary to the practise of the Catholike Church. *Res enim ordinis non possunt delegari*, is a most certain rule in Divinity, and admitted by men of all sides, and most different intercsts.

* How.

* However we see here, that they were prohibited, and we never find before this time, that any of them actually did give orders, neither by ordinary power, nor extraordinary dispensation; and the constant tradition of the Church, and practise *Apostolicall* is, that they never could give orders; therefore this exposition of the Canon is liable to no exception, but is cleare for the illegality of a *Presbyter* giving holy orders, either to a *Presbyter*, or a *Deacon*, and is concluding for the necessity of concurrence both of *Episcopall* order, and jurisdiction for ordinations, for, *reddendo singula singulis*, and expounding this Canon according to the sense of the Church, and exigence of Catholike Custome, the *Chorepiscopi* are excluded from giving orders for want of jurisdiction, and the Priests of the Citty for want of order; the first may be supplied by a delegate power *in literis Episcopalibus*, the second cannot, but by a new ordination, that is, by making the *Priest* a *Bishop*. For if a *Priest* of the Citty have not so much power as a *Chorepiscopus*, as I have proved he hath not, by shewing that the *Chorepiscopus* then had Episcopall ordination, and yet the *Chorepiscopus* might not collate orders without a faculty from the *Bishop*, the City *Priests* might not doe it, unlesse more be added to them, for their want was more. They not only want jurisdiction, but something besides, and that must needs be order.

* But although these *Chorepiscopi* at the first had Episcopall Ordination, yet it was quickly taken from

temporary mission, that the *Chorepiscopi* were by an ordinary, and fixt residence might perhaps think that their commission might extend farther then it did, or that they might goe beyond it, as well as the *Chorepiscopi*, and therefore their way was obstructed by this clause of ἀλλὰ μηδὲ πρεσβυτέρους πόλεως. * Adde to this; The *Presbyters* of the City were of great honour, and peculiar priviledge, as appeares in the thirteenth Canon of the Councell of *Neo-Cæsarea*, and therefore might easily exceed, if the Canon had not beene their bridle.

The summe of the Canon is this. With the *Bishops* licence the *Chorepiscopi* might ordaine, for themselves had *Episcopall ordination*, but without licence they might not, for they had but delegate, and subordinate jurisdiction; And therefore in the *fourteenth Canon* of *Neo-Cæsarea* are said to be εἰς τόπον τῶν ἑβδομήκοντα, like the 70 *Disciples*, that is, inferior to *Bishops*, and the 70 were to the *twelve Apostles*, *viz. in hoc particulari*, not in order, but like them in subordination and inferiority of jurisdiction: but the Citty *Presbyters* might not ordaine, neither with, nor without licence; for they are in the Canon only by way of parenthesis, and the sequence of procuring a faculty from the *Bishops* to collate orders, is to be referred to *Chorepiscopi*, not to *Presbyteri Civitatis*, unlesse we should straine this Canon into a sense contrary to the practise of the Catholike Church. *Res enim ordinis non possunt delegari*, is a most certain rule in Divinity, and admitted by men of all sides, and most different intercsts.

* How.

* However we see here, that they were prohibited, and we never find before this time, that any of them actually did give orders, neither by ordinary power, nor extraordinary dispensation; and the constant tradition of the Church, and practise *Apostolicall* is, that they never could give orders; therefore this exposition of the Canon is liable to no exception, but is cleare for the illegality of a *Presbyter* giving holy orders, either to a *Presbyter*, or a *Deacon*, and is concluding for the necessity of concurrence both of *Episcopall* order, and jurisdiction for ordinations, for, *reddendo singula singulis*, and expounding this Canon according to the sense of the Church, and exigence of Catholike Custome, the *Chorepiscopi* are excluded from giving orders for want of jurisdiction, and the Priests of the Citty for want of order; the first may be supplied by a delegate power *in literis Episcopalibus*, the second cannot, but by a new ordination, that is, by making the *Priest* a *Bishop*. For if a *Priest* of the Citty have not so much power as a *Chorepiscopus*, as I have proved he hath not, by shewing that the *Chorepiscopus* then had Episcopall ordination, and yet the *Chorepiscopus* might not collate orders without a faculty from the *Bishop*, the City *Priests* might not doe it, unlesse more be added to them, for their want was more. They not only want jurisdiction, but something besides, and that must needs be order.

* But although these *Chorepiscopi* at the first had Episcopall Ordination, yet it was quickly taken from

them for their incroachment upon the *Bishops Dioceſſe*, and as they were but *Vicarij*, or *visitatores Episcoporum in villis*, ſo their ordination was but to a meere *Presbyterate*. And this we find, as ſoone as ever we heare that they had had Epiſcopall Ordination. For thoſe who in the beginning of the 10th Canon of *Antioch* we find had been conſecrated as Biſhops, in the end of the ſame Canon, we find it decreed *de novo*: χωρεπίσκοπον ἢ μὴν ὑπὸ τῆς πόλεως ἧς ὑπόκειται ὀφείλοντα. *The Chorepiſcopus or Country Biſhop muſt be ordayn'd by the Biſhop of the Citie, in whoſe juriſdiction he is*; which was clearly ordination to the order of a Presbyter, and no more. And ever after this all the ordinations they made were only to the inferiour Miniſteries, with the Biſhop's Licenſe too, but they never ordayn'd any to be *Deacons*, or *Prieſts*; for theſe were Orders of the *Holy Ghoſt's* appointing, and therefore were *gratiæ ſpiritûs Sancti*, and iſſues of order; but the inferiour Miniſteries, as of a *Reader*, an *Oſtiary* &c. were humane conſtitutions, and requir'd not the capacity of *Epiſcopall* Order to collate them; for they were not *Graces of the Holy Ghoſt*, as all Orders properly ſo called are, but might by humane diſpenſation be beſtow'd, as well as by humane Ordinance, they had their firſt conſtitution. *

* The *Chorepiſcopi* laſted in this conſiſtence till they were quite taken away by the Councell of *Hiſpalis*: ſave only, that ſuch men alſo were called *Chorepiſcopi* who had beene *Biſhops* of Cities, but had fallen from their honour by communicating in Gentile

Gentile Sacrifices, and by being *traditors*, but in case they repented and were reconciled, they had not indeed restitution to their See, but, because they had the indelible character of a *Bishop*, they were allowed the Name, and honour, and sometime the execution of offices *Chorepiscopall*. Now of this sort of *Chorepiscopi* no objection can be pretended, if they had made ordinations; and of the other nothing pertinent, for they also had the ordination, and order of *Bishops*. The former was the case of *Meletius* in the *Nicene Councell*, as is to be seene in the Epistle of the Fathers to the Church of *Alexandria*. * But however all this while, the power of ordination is so fast held in the *Bishops* hand, that it was communicated to none though of the greatest priviledge.

tripart hist. lib 2. c. 12. ex Theodoret.

* I find the like care taken in the Councell of *Sardis*, for when *Musæus*, and *Eutychianus* had ordain'd some Clerkes, themselves not being *Bishops*, *Gaudentius* (one of the moderate men, 'tis likely) for quietnesse sake, and to comply with the times, would faine have had those Clerks received into Clericall commurion; but the Councell would by no meanes admitt that any should be received into the Clergy ἀλλ' ἐκείνους τοὺς ἱερωθέντας παρὰ τούτων τῶν ἀληθείᾳ μὴ ὄντων ἐπισκόπων, (as *Balsamon* expresses upon that Canon,) *but such as were ordain'd by them who were Bishops verily, and indeed.* But with those who were ordain'd by *Musæus* and *Eutychianus*, ὡς λαϊκοῖς συγκοινωνήσαμεν *we will communicate as with Laymen:* ἢ μὴν ὅδε ὅρος ἐπισκόπῳ δοῦναι ἐκδικεῖν οἱ αὐτὸς πόκα χειρο-

Can: 19.

τονήσαντες, *for they were no Bishops that impos'd hands on them*; and therefore the Clerks were not ordain'd truly, but were πλασάμενοι χειροτονίαν, *dissemblers of ordination*. *Quæ autem de Musæo & Eutychiano dicta sunt, trahe etiam ad alios qui non ordinati fuerunt*, &c. Saith *Balsamon*, intimating, that it is a rul'd case and of publike interest.

* The same was the issue of those two famous cases, the one of *Ischiras* ordain'd of *Colluthus* φαντάσματος ἱποσκοπῶ, one that dream'd onely he was a *Bishop*. *Ischiras* being ordain'd by him could be no Priest, nor any else of his ordaining, ᾗ πᾶσα χειρ ἀν τῆ γένοιτο ἄκυρος, and *Ischyras* himselfe was reduc'd into lay communion, being depos'd by the Synod of *Alexandria*, ἐκπεσὼν ᾗ τῆς ψυχῆς ὑπονοίας τῆ φρισυτέρω, *falling from the imagination of his Presbyterate*, say the *Priests* and *Deacons* of *Mareotis*; And of the rest that were ordain'd with *Ischiras*, λαϊκοὶ γεγόνασιν ὅτω συνάγοντες saith S. *Athanasius*, and this so knowne a businesse, ὡς ὐδενὶ καθήκειν ἀμφίβολον, *No man made scruple of the Nullity*. * * The paralell case is of the *Presbyters* ordain'd by *Maximus*, who was another *Bishop* in the aire too; all his ordinations were pronounced null, by the Fathers of the Councell in *Constantinople*. A third is of the blind Bishop of *Agabra* imposing hands while his Presbyters read the words of ordination, the ordination was pronounced invalid by the first Councell of *Sevill*. These cases are so known, I need not insist on them. This onely,

Apud Athanas. Apolog. 2. epist. Presb. & Diacon: Mareotic: ad Curiosum & Philagrium.

Cap. 4.

Cap. 5.

In diverse cases of Transgression of the Canons, Clergy

Clergy men were reduc'd to lay communion, either being suspended, or deposed; that is, from their place of honour, and execution of their function, with, or without hope of restitution respectively; but then still they had their order, and the Sacraments conferr'd by them were valid, though they indeed were prohibited to Minister; but in the cases of the present instance, the ordinations were pronounc'd as null, to have bestowed nothing, and to be meerely imaginary.

* But so also it was *in* case that Bishops ordain'd without a title, or in the dioceſſe of another Bishop, as in the Councell of † *Chalcedon*, and of * *Antioch* παύτα τὰ ἄκυρα. And may be it was so in case of ordination by a *Presbyter*, it was by positive constitution pronounced void, and no more, and therefore may be rescinded by the Counter-mand of an equall power; A Councell at most may doe it, and therefore without a Councell, a probable necessity will let us loose. But to this the answer is evident. † *Can.* 6. * *Can.* 13.

1. The expressions in the severall cases are severall, & of diverse issue, for in case of those nullities which are meerely Canonicall, they are expressed as then first made, but in the case of ordination by a *Non-Bishop*, they are onely declared voy'd *ipso facto*. And therefore in that decree of *Chalcedon* against *Sine titular* ordinations, the Canon saith; τὰς ἢ ἀπολύτως χειροτονουμένας ὥρισεν ἡ ἁγία σύνοδος ἄκυρον ἔχειν πὼ τοιαύτῃ χειροθεσίαν, IRRITAM EXISTIMARI *manûs impositionem, to be esteem'd as null*, that is, not to have Canonicall approbation, but is not declared null,

in

in Naturâ rei, as it is in the foregoing instances.

2. In the cases of *Antioch*, and *Chalcedon*, the decree is *pro futuro*, which makes it evident that those nullities are such as are made by Canon, but in the cases of *Colluthus*, and *Maximus*, there was declaration of a past nullity and that before any Canon was made; and though Synodall declarations pronoun'd such ordinations invalid, yet none decreed so for the future, which is a cleare evidence, that this nullity, viz: in case of ordination by a *Non-Presbyter*, is not made by Canon, but by Canon declar'd to be invalid in the nature of the thing.

3. If to this be added, that in antiquity it was dogmatically resolved that by the Nature, and institution of the Order of *Bishops*; ordination was appropriate to them, then it will also from hence be evident, that the nullity of ordination without a *Bishop* is not dependant upon positive constitution, but on the exigence of the institution. * * Now that the power of ordination was onely in the *Bishop*, even they, who to advance the *Presbyters*, were willing enough to speake lesse for *Episcopacy*, give testimony; making this the proper distinctive cognisance of a *Bishop* from a *Presbyter*, that the *Bishop* hath power of ordination, the *Presbyter* hath not. So S. *Ierome*, *Quid facit Episcopus (except â ordinatione) quod Presbyter non faciat*. All things (saith he) [to wit all things of precise order] are common to *Bishops* with *Priests*, except ordination, for that is proper to the *Bishop*. And S. *Chrysostome*, *Solâ quippe ordinatione superiores illis sunt* [*Episcopi*]

ad Evagrium.

homil. 2. in 1. Tim. 2.

atq; hoc tantùm plusquam Presbyteri habere videntur. Ordination is the proper, and peculiar function of a *Bishop*; and therefore not given him by positive constitution of the Canon.

4. No man was call'd an heretick for breach of Canon, but for denying the power of ordination to be proper to a *Bishop*: *Aërius* was by *Epiphanius*, *Philastrius*, and S. *Austin* condemn'd, and branded for heresie, and by the Catholike Church saith *Epiphanius*. This power therefore came from a higher spring, then positive and Canonicall Sanction. But now proceed.

The Councell held in *Trullo*, complaining that the incursion of the barbarous people upon the Churches inheritance, saith that it forc'd some Bishops from their residence, & made that they could not κατὰ τὸ κρατῆσαν ἔθος τὰς χειροτονίας καὶ πάντα ἃ τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ αὐτὴκει πεξάλτειν τε καὶ μετακείζεσθαι, *according to the guise of the Church, give Orders and doe such things as* DID BELONG TO THE BISHOP; and in the sequel of the Canon they are permitted in such cases, *ut & diversorum Clericorum ordinationes canonicè faciant, to make Canonicall ordinations of Clergy men.* Giving of Orders is proper, it belongs to a *Bishop*. So the Councell. And therefore *Theodoret* expounding that place of S. *Paul* [*by the laying on the hands of the Presbytery*] interprets it of *Bishops*, for this reason, because *Presbyters* did not impose hands. Can. 37.

* There is an imperfect Canon in the *Arausican* Councell that hath an expression very pertinent to this purpose, *Ea quæ non nisi per Episcopos geruntur*, Can. 20.

those things that are not done, but by *Bishops*, they were decreed still to be done by *Bishops*, though he that was to doe them regularly, did fall into any infirmity whatsoever, yet *non sub præsentiâ suâ Presbyteros agere permittat, sed evocet Episcopum.* Here are clearely by this Canon some things suppos'd to be proper to the *Bishops*, to the action of which *Presbyters* must in no case be admitted. The particulars, what they are, are not specified in the Canon, but are nam'd before, viz: *Orders*, and *Confirmation*, for almost the whole Councell was concerning them, and nothing else is properly the *agendum Episcopi*, and the Canon else is not to be Understood. * To the same issue is that circum-locutory description, or name of a *Bishop*, us'd by S. *Chrysostome*, ὁ μέλλων ἡμᾶς χειροτονήσειν. *The man that is to ordaine Clerks.*

haref. 75. * And all this is but the doctrine of the Catholike Church which S. *Epiphanius* oppos'd to the doctrine of *Aërius*, denying *Episcopacy* to be a distinct order Ἡ μὲν γὰρ (speaking of *Episcopacy*) ἐστὶ πατέρων γενικὴ τάξις, πατέρας γὰρ γεννᾷ τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ· ἡ δὲ πρεσβυτέρα μὴ δυναμένη γεννᾶν, speaking of *Presbytery*. *The order of Bishops begets Fathers to the Church of God, but the order of Presbyters begets sonnes in baptisme, but no Fathers or Doctors by ordination.* * It is a very remarkeable passage related by *Eusebius* in the ordination of *Novatus* to be *Presbyter*, the *Bishop* did it διακωλυόμενος ὑπὸ παντὸς τοῦ κλήρου, all the whole Clergy was against it, yet the *Bishop* did ordaine him, and then certainely scarce any conjunction of the

Euseb. lib. 6. cap. 33.

the other Clergy can be imagined; I am sure none is either expressed or intimated. For it was a rul'd case, and attested by the Uniforme practise of the Church, which was set downe in the third Councell of *Carthage*, *Episcopus vnus esse potest per quem dignatione Divinâ Presbyteri multi constitui possunt.* Can. 45. This case I instance the more particularly, because it is an exact determination of a *Bishops* sole power of ordination. *Aurelius* made a motion, that, if a Church wanted a *Presbyter* to become her *Bishop*, they might demand one from any *Bishop*. It was granted; But *Posthumianus* the *Bishop* put this case. *Deinde qui vnum habuerit, numquid debet illi ipse vnus Presbyter auferri? How if the* Bishop *have but one Priest, must his* Bishop *part with him to supply the necessity of the Neighbour widdow-Church?* Yea, that he must. But how then shall he keepe ordinations when he hath never a *Presbyter* to assist him? That indeed would have beene the objection now, but it was none then. For *Aurelius* told them plainly, there was no inconvenience in it, for though a *Bishop* have never a *Presbyter*, no great matter, he can himselfe ordaine many (and then I am sure, there is sole ordination) but if a *Bishop* be wanting to a Church, he is not so easily found.

* * Thus it went ordinarily in the stile of the Church, ordinations were made by the *Bishop*, and the ordainer spoken of as a single person. So it is in the *Nicene* Councell, the Councell of [a] *Antioch*, the Councell of [b] *Chalcedon*, and S. *Ierome* who writing to *Pammachius* against the errors of *Iohn of Ierusalem*;

[a] *Cap.* 19. [a] *Cap.* 9. [b] *Cap.* 2. & 6.

rusalem; If thou speake (saith he) of *Paulinianus*, he comes now and then to visit us, not as any of your Clergy, but *ejus à quo ordinatus est*, *that Bishop's who ordain'd him.*

* So that the issue of this argument is this. The *Canons* of the *Apostles*, and the *rules* of the *Ancient Councells* appropriate the ordination of *Bishops* to *Bishops*, of *Presbyters* to one *Bishop*, (for I never find a *Presbyter* ordain'd by two *Bishops* together, but onely *Origen* by the *Bishops of Ierusalem*, and *Cæsarea*) *Presbyters* are never mention'd in conjunction with *Bishops* at their ordinations, and if alone they did it, their ordination was pronounced invalid and void *ab initio.*

* To these particulars adde this, that *Bishops* alone were punished if ordinations were *Vncanonicall*, which were most vnreasonable if *Presbyters* did joine in them, and were causes in conjunction. But unlesse they did it alone, we never read that they were punishable; indeed *Bishops* were *pro toto, & integro*, as is reported by *Sozomen* in the case of *Elpidius*, *Eustathius*, *Basilius of Ancyra*, and *Eleusius*. Thus also it was decreed in the second, and sixt Chapters of the *Councell of Chalcedon*, and in the *Imperiall constitutions*. Since therefore we neither find *Presbyters* join'd with *Bishops* in *commission*, or *practise*, or *penalty* all this while. I may inferre from the premises the same thing which the *Councell of Hispalis* expresses in direct, and full sentence, *Episcopus Sacerdotibus, ac Ministris solus honorem dare potest, solus auferre non potest.* The *Bishop* alone

Novell: constit. 6. & 123. cap. 16.

Cap: 6.

lone may give the *Priestly* honour, he alone is not suffer'd to take it away. * This Councell was held in the yeare 657, and I set it downe here for this purpose to show that the decree of the fourth *Councell of Carthage* which was the first that licensed *Priests* to assist *Bishops in ordinations* yet was not obligatory in the West; but for almost 300 yeares after, ordinations were made by *Bishops alone*. But till this Councell no pretence of any such conjunction, and after this Councell sole ordination did not expire in the West for above 200 yeares together; but for ought I know, ever since then, it hath obtain'd, that although *Presbyters* joyne not in the consecration of a *Bishop*, yet of a *Presbyter* they doe; but this is onely by a positive subintroduced constitution first made in a *Provinciall of Africa*, and in other places received by insinuation and conformity of practise. *Can: 2, & 3.*

* I know not what can be said against it. I onely find a peice of an objection out of S. *Cyprian*, who was a Man so complying with the Subjects of his Diocesse, that if any man, he was like to furnish us with an Antinomy. * *Hunc igitur (Fratres Dilectissimi) à me, & à Collegis qui præsentes aderant ordinatum sciatis.* Here either by his Colleagues he meanes *Bishops*, or *Presbyters*. If *Bishops*, then many *Bishops* will be found in the ordination of one to an inferiour order, which because it was (as I observ'd before) against the practise of Christendome, will not easily be admitted to be the sense of S. *Cyprian*. But if he means *Presbyters* by [*Collegæ*] then sole *Epist.* 33.

ordination is invalidated by this exa'mple, for *Presbyters* join'd with him in the ordi'ation of *Aurelius*.

I answer, that it matters not whether by his Colleagues he means one, or the other, for *Aurelius* the Confessor who was the man ordain'd, was ordain'd but to be a Reader, and that was no *Order of Divine institution*, no gift of the *Holy Ghost*, and therefore might be dispensed by one, or more; by Bishops, or Presbyters, and no way enters into the consideration of this question concerning the power of collating those orders which are gifts of the *Holy Ghost*, and of *divine ordinance*; and therefore, this, although I have seen it once pretended, yet hath no validity to impugne the constant p actise of Primitive antiquity.

But then are all ordinations invalid which are done by meere *Presbyters* without a *Bishop*? What think we of the reformed Churches?

1. For my part I know not what to think. The question hath been so often asked with so much violence, and prejudice; and we are so bound by publike interest to approve all that they doe, that wee have disabled our selves to justify our owne. For we were glad at first of abettors against the Errors of the Romane Church, we found these men zealous in it, we thank'd God for it (as we had cause) and we were willing to make them recompence, by endeavouring to justify their ordinations; not thinking what would follow upon our selves. But now it is come to that issue, that our own *Episcopacy* is

cy is thought not necessary, because wee did not condemne the ordinations of their *Presbytery*.

2. Why is not the question rather, what we think of the *Primitive Church*, then what we think of the *reformed Churches*? Did the Primitive Councells, and Fathers doe well in condemning the ordinations made by meere *Presbyters*? If they did well, what was a vertue in them, is no sinne in us. If they did ill, from what principle shall wee judge of the right of ordinations? since there is no example in Scripture of any ordination made but by *Apostles*, and *Bishops*, and the *Presbytery* that impos'd hands on *Timothy*, is by all antiquity expounded either of the office, or of a Colledge of *Presbyters*; and S. *Paul* expounds it to be an ordination made by his owne hands, as appeares by comparing the two epistles to *S. Timothy* together; and may be so meant by the principles of all sides, for if the names be confounded, then *Presbyter* may signify a *Bishop*, and that they of this *Presbytery* were not *Bishops*, they can never prove from Scripture, where all men grant that the Names are confounded.

* So that whence will men take their estimate for the rites of ordinations? From *Scripture*? That gives it alwayes to *Apostles*, and *Bishops* (as I have proved) and that a *Priest* did ever impose hands for ordination can never be showne from thence. From whence then? From *Antiquity*? That was so farre from licensing ordinations made by *Presbyters* alone, that *Presbyters* in the primitive Church did never

never joyne with *Bishops* in Collation of holy Orders of *Presbyter*, and *Deacon*, till the 4th *Councell of Carthage*; much lesse doe it alone, rightly, and with effect. So that, as in *Scripture* there is nothing for *Presbyters* ordaining, so in *Antiquity* here is much against it; And either in this particular we must have strange thoughts of *Scripture*, and *Antiquity*, or not so faire interpretation of the ordinations of reformed *Presbyteries*. But for my part I had rather speake a truth in sincerity, then erre with a glorious correspondence.

But will not necessity excuse them who could not have orders from Orthodoxe *Bishops*? shall we either sinne against our consciences by subscribing to hereticall, and false resolutions *in materiâ fidei*, or else loose the being of a Church, for want of *Episcopall ordinations*? * Indeed if the case were just thus it was very hard with the good people of the transmarine Churches; but I have here two things to consider.

1. I am very willing to beleive that they would not have done any thing either of error, or suspition, but in cases of necessity. But then I consider that *M. Du Plessis*, a man of honour, and Great learning does attest, that at the first reformation there were many *Arch-Bishops* and *Cardinalls* in *Germany*, *England*, *France*, and *Italy* that joyn'd in the reformation, whom they might, but did not imploy in their ordinations; And what necessity then can be pretended in this case, I would faine learne that I might make their defence. But, which is of more, and

de Eccles. cap. 11.

deeper

deeper consideration; for this might have been done by inconsideration, and irresolution, as often happens in the beginning of great changes, but, it is their constant and resolved practise at least in *France*, that if any returnes to them they will reordayne him by their *Presbytery*, though he had before *Episcopall* Ordination, as both their friends and their enemies beare witnesse. *Daneus pavi. 2. Isagog. lib. 2. cap. 22. Perron. repl. fol: 92. impress. 1605.*

2. I consider that necessity may excuse a personall delinquency; but I never heard that necessity did build a Church. Indeed no man is forc'd for his owne particular to committ a sinne, for if it be absolutely a case of necessity, the action ceases to be a sinne; but indeed if God meanes to build a Church in any place, he will doe it by meanes proportionable to that end; that is, by putting them into a possibility of doing, and acquiring those things which himselfe hath required of necessity to the constitution of a Church. * So that, supposing that Ordination by a *Bishop* is necessary for the vocation of *Priests*, and *Deacons* (as I have proved it is) and therefore for the founding, or perpetuating of a Church, either God hath given to all Churches opportunity and possibility of such Ordinations, and then, necessity of the contrary, is but pretence and mockery, or if he hath not given such possibility, then there is no Church there to be either built, or continued, but the Candlestick is presently removed.

There 'are diverse stories in *Ruffinus* to this purpose. When *Ædesius* and *Frumentius* were surpri- *Eccles. hist: lib. 10. cap. 9. per Ruffinum.*

zed by the Barbarous *Indians*, they preached Christianity, and baptized many, but themselves being but *Lay-men* could make no *Ordinations*, and so not fixe a Church. What then was to be done in the case? *Frumentius Alexandriam pergit .... & rem omnem, ut gesta est, narrat* EPISCOPO, *ac monet, ut provideat virum aliquem dignum quem congregatis jam plurimis Christianis in Barbaria solo Episcopum mittat. Frumentius* comes to *Alexandria* to get a *Bishop*. *Athanasius* being then *Patriarch* ordayn'd *Frumentius* their *Bishop*, *& tradito ei Sacerdotio, redire eum cum Domini Gratiâ unde venerat jubet .... ex quo* (saith *Ruffinus*) *in Indiæ partibus, & populi Christianorum & Ecclesiæ factæ sunt, & Sacerdotium cæpit.*

Ibidem c. 10. *& apud Theodoret. l.* 1. The same happened in the case of the *Iberians* converted by a Captive woman; *postea verò quàm Ecclesia magnificè constructa est, & populi fidem Dei majore ardore sitiebant, captivæ omnitis ad Imperatorem Constantinum totius Gentis legatio mittitur: Res gesta exponitur:* SACERDOTES *mittere oratur qui cæptum ergà se Dei munus implerent.* The worke of Christianity could not be completed, nor a Church founded without the *Ministery* of *Bishops*. * Thus the case is evident, that the want of a *Bishop* will not excuse us from our endeavours of acquiring one; and where God meanes to found a Church there he will supply them with those meanes, and Ministeries which himselfe hath made of ordinary and absolute necessity. And therefore if it happens that those *Bishops* which are of ordinary Ministrati-

on

on amongst us, prove hereticall, still Gods Church is Catholike, and though with trouble, yet Orthodoxe *Bishops* may be acquir'd. For just so it happen'd when *Mauvia* Queene of the *Saracens* was so earnest to have *Moses* the Hermit made the *Bishop* of her Nation, and offer'd peace to the Catholikes upō that condition; *Lucius* an *Arrian* troubled the affayre by his interposing and offering to ordayne *Moses*; The Hermit discover'd his vileneſſe, *& ita majore dedecore deformatus compulsus est acquiescere.* *Moses* refus'd to be ordayn'd by him that was an *Arrian.* So did the reform'd Churches refuse ordinations by the *Bishops* of the *Roman* communion. But what then might they have done? Even the same that *Moses* did in that necessity; *compulsus est ab Episcopis quos in exilium truserat (Lucius) sacerdotium sumere.* Those good people might have had orders from the *Bishops* of *England*, or the *Lutheran Churches*, if at least they thought our Churches *Catholike*, and *Christian.*

Eccles: hist. lib. 11. cap. 6. per Russinum.

If an ordinary necessity will not excuse this, will not an extraordinary calling justifie it? Yea, most certainely, could we but see an ordinary proofe for an extraordinary calling, viz: an evident prophecy, demonstration of Miracles, certainety of reason, clarity of sense, or any thing that might make faith of an extraordinary mission.

But shall we then condemne those few of the Reformed Churches whose ordinations alwaies have beene without *Bishops*? No indeed. That must not be. They stand, or fall to their owne Master. And

though I cannot justifie their ordinations, yet what degree their Necessity is of, what their desire of *Episcopall* ordinations may doe for their personall excuse, and how farre a good life, and a *Catholike beleife* may leade a man in the way to heaven, (although the formes of externall communion be not observ'd) I cannot determine. * For ought I know, their condition is the same with that of the Church of *Pergamus* [*I know thy works, and where thou dwellest, even where Sathans seate is, and thou heldest fast my* FAITH, *and hast not denied my Name; Nihi. lominus habeo adversus te pauca, some few things I have against thee;*] and yet of them, the want of Canonicall ordinations is a defect which I trust themselves desire to be remedied; but if it cannot be done, their sinne indeed is the lesse, but their misery the Greater. * I am sure I have said sooth, but whether or no it will be thought so, I cannot tell; and yet why it may not I cannot guesse, unlesse they only be impeccable, which I suppose will not so easily be thought of them, who themselves thinke, that all the Church possibly may faile. But this I would not have declar'd so freely, had not the necessity of our owne Churches requir'd it, and that the first pretence of the legality, and validity of their ordinations beene boyed up to the height of an absolute necessity; for else why shall it be called Tyranny in us to call on them to conforme to us, and to the practise of the *Catholike Church*, and yet in them be called a good and a holy zeale to exact our conformity to them; But I hope it will so happen to us, that

that it will be verifyed here, what was once said of the Catholikes under the fury of *Iustina*, *sed tanta fuit perseverantia fidelium populorum, vt animas priùs amittere, quàm Episcopum mallent*; If it were put to our choice, rather to dye (to wit the death of *Martyrs*, not rebells) then loose the sacred order, and offices of *Episcopacy*, without which no Priest, no ordination, no consecration of the Sacrament, no absolution, no rite, or Sacrament legitimately can be performed in order to eternity.

The summe is this. If the Canons, and Sanctions *Apostolicall*, if the decrees of eight famous Councells in Christendome, of *Ancyra*, of *Antioch*, of *Sardis*, of *Alexandria*, two of *Constantinople*, the *Arausican* Councell, and that of *Hispalis*; if the constant successive Acts of the famous *Martyr* Bishops of *Rome* making ordinations, if the testimony of the whole *Pontificall book*, if the *dogmaticall resolution* of so many *Fathers*, S. *Denis*, S. *Cornelius*, S. *Athanasius*, S. *Hierome*, S. *Chrysostome*, S. *Epiphanius*, S. *Austin*, and diverse others, all appropriating ordinations to the Bishops hand: if the *constant voice of Christendome*, declaring ordinations made by *Presbyters*, to be null, and voide in the nature of the thing: and *never any* act of ordination by a *Non-Bishop*, approoved by *any Councell*, *decretall*, or *single suffrage* of any famous man in Christendome: if that ordinations of Bishops were alwaies made, and they ever done by Bishops, and no pretence of *Priests* joyning with them in their consecrations, and after all this it was declared heresy to

communicate the power of giving orders to *Presbyters* either alone, or in conjunction with *Bishops*, as it was in the case of *Aërius*: if all this, that is, if whatsoever can be imagined, be sufficient to make faith in this particular; then it is evident that the power, and order of *Bishops* is greater then the power, and order of *Presbyters*, to wit, in this Great particular of ordination, and that by this loud voyce, and united vote of Christendome.

§ 33. And Confirmation,

* BUT this was but the first part of the power which *Catholick antiquity* affixed to the order of *Episcopacy*. The next is of *Confirmation of baptized people*. And here the rule was this, which was thus expressed by *Damascen*: *Apostolorum, & Successorum eorum est per manûs impositionem donum Spiritus sancti tradere*. It belongs to the Apostles and their successors to give the Holy Ghost by imposition of hands. But see this in particular instance.

Epist. de Chorepisc.

The Councell of *Eliberis* giving permission to faithfull people of the Laity to baptize Catechumens in cases of necessity, and exigence of journey; *ita tamen ut si supervixerit* [*baptizatus*] *ad Episcopum eum perducat, ut per manûs impositionem proficere possit*. Let him be carried to the Bishop to be improv'd by imposition of the BISHOPS hands. This was Law.

Epist. ad Iubaian.

It was also custome saith S. *Cyprian*, *Quod nunc quoq; apud nos geritur, ut qui in Ecclesiâ baptizantur, per Præpositos Ecclesiæ offerantur, & per nostram orationem*

orationem, & manûs impositionem Spiritum sanctum consequantur, & signaculo Dominico consummentur. And this custome was *Catholick* too, and the Law was of *Vniversall* concernement. OMNES *Fideles per manuum impositionem* EPISCOPORUM *Spiritum Sanctum post baptismum accipere debent, ut pleni Christiani accipere debent.* So S. *Vrbane* in his decretall Epistle; And, *Omnibus festinandum est sine morâ renasci, & demùm* CONSIGNARI AB EPISCOPO *Et septiformem Spiritûs sancti gratiam recipere*; so saith the old Author of the fourth Epistle under the name of S. *Clement.* ALL FAITHFULL baptized people must goe to the *Bishop* to be consign'd, and so by imposition of *the Bishops hands* to obtaine the seven fold guifts of the Holy Ghost. *Apud* Sev. Binium in 1. tom. Concil.

Meltiades in his Epistle to the *Bishops* of Spaine affirmes confirmation in this, to have a speciall excellency besides baptisme, *quòd solùm à summis Sacerdotibus confertur*, because *Bishops* only can give confirmation; And the same is said, & proov'd by S. *Eusebius* in his third Epistle enjoyning great veneration to this holy mystery, *quod ab aliis perfici non potest nisi à summis Sacerdotibus.* It cannot, it may not be perform'd by any, but by the *Bishops.*

Thus S. *Chrysostome* speaking of S. *Philip* converting the *Samaritans*, διὰ τί βαπτίζων, πνεῦμα τοῖς βαπτιζομένοις οὐκ ἐδίδου. οὐδὲ γὰρ εἶχεν ἐξουσίαν. τοῦτο γὰρ τὸ δῶρον μόνων τῶν δώδεκα ἦν. *Philip* baptizing the men of *Samaria*, gave not the *Holy Ghost* to them whom he had baptized. For HE HAD NOT POWER. For this guift was only of the twelve *Apostles.* And a little after *Homil.* 18. *in Act.*

after: τῆτο ἰδίᾳ τῶν Ἀποστόλων ἐξαίρετον. This was PECULIAR to the *Apostles*. ὅθεν καὶ τῆς χορυφαίας, ἢν ἄλλως πνὰς ὄζιν ἱλεῖν ἔτο ποιοῦντας, whence it comes to passe, that the principall and chiefe of the Church doe it, and none elsse. And *George Pachymeres*, the Paraphrast of S. *Dionysius*; χρεία ἔ ἀρχιερέως ἔσαι ἵνς τὸ χρῖσαι τῷ μύρῳ ἔ Καπιδόντα. ἄυτη δὲ ἰδίᾳ ἡ ἀρχιερατικὴ σωνάδεια. It is required that a *Bishop* should consigne faithfull people baptiz'd. For this was the *Ancient practise*.

In cap. 5. de Eccles. hierarch.

I shall not need to instance in too many particulars, for that the Ministry of confirmation was by Catholick custome appropriate to *Bishops* in all ages of the Primitive Church is to be seen by the concurrent testimony of Councels, & Fathers; particularly of S. *Clemens Alexandrinus* in * *Eusebius*, [a] *Tertullian*, S. [b] *Innocentius* the first, [c] *Damasus*, [d] S. *Leo*, in [e] *John* the third, in S. [f] *Gregory*, *Amphilochius* in the life of S. *Basil* telling the story of Bishop *Maximinus* confirming *Basilius*, and *Eubulus*, the [g] Councell of *Orleans*, and of [h] *Melda*, and lastly of [i] *Sevill* which affirmes, *Non licere Presbyteris .... per impositionem manûs fidelibus baptizandis paracletum spiritum tradere. It is not lawfull for Presbyters to give confirmation, for it is properly an act of Episcopall power .... Christe date spiritus S. superinfunditur. Vtraq; verò ista manu, & ore Antistitis impetramus.* These are enough for authority, and dogmaticall resolution from antiquity. For truth is, the first that ever did communicate the power of confirming to *Presbyters* was *Photius*, the first author of that unhappy and long lasting schisme

* *Lib.* 3. *hist. cap.* 17.
a *De Baptismo.*
b *Epist.* 1. *cap.* 3. *ad Decent.*
c *Epist.* 4.
d *Epist.* 88.
e *Epist. ad Episc. German.*
f *Lib.* 3. *ep.* 9.
g Apud Gratian. *de consecrat. dist.* 5. *can. ut jejuni.*
h *Ibid. Can. ut Episcopi.*
i *Concil. Hispal. can.* 7.

schisme between the *Latine*, and *Greek* Churches, and it was upon this occasion too. For when the *Bulgarians* were first converted, the *Greekes* sent Presbyters to baptize, and to confirme them. But the *Latins* sent againe to have them re-confirmed, both becaus̄e (as they pretended) the Greekes had no jurisdiction in *Bulgaria*, nor the *Presbyters* a capacity of *order* to give *confirmation*. *vide Anasta. biblioth. præfat. in Can. 8. Synodi.*

The matters of fact, and acts Episcopall of confirmation are innumerable, but most famous are those confirmations made by S. *Rembert* Bishop of *Brema*, and of S. *Malchus* attested by S. *Bernard*, becaus̄e they were ratified by miracle, saith the Ancient story. I end this with the saying of S. *Hierome*, *Exigis ubi scriptum sit? In Actibus Apostolorum. Sed etiamsi Scripturæ authoritas non subesset, totius orbis in hanc partem consensus instar præcepti obtineret. If you aske where it is written? (viz.* that Bishops alone should confirme) *It is written in the Acts of the Apostles* (meaning, by precedent, though not expresse precept) *but if there were no authority of Scripture for it, yet the consent of all the world upon this particular is instead of a command.* *** It was fortunate that S. *Hierome* hath expressed himselfe so confidently in this affaire, for by this we are arm'd against an objection from his own words, for in the same dialogue, speaking of some acts of *Episcopall* priviledge and peculiar ministration, particularly, of *Confirmation*, he saies, it was *ad honorem potius Sacerdotii quàm ad legis necessitatem. For the honour of the Priesthood, rather then for the necessity of a law.* *vide Optatum. lib. 2. S. Bernard. in vitâ S Malachiæ. Surium. tom. 1. in Febr. dial. adv. Lucifer.*

To this the answer is evident from his own words: That *Bishops* should give the Holy Ghost in confirmation, is written in the Acts of the *Apostles*; and now that this is reserved rather for the honour of *Episcopacy*, then a simple necessity in the nature of the thing makes no matter. For the question here that is only of concernment, is not to what end this power is reserved to the *Bishop*, but by whom it was reserved? Now S. *Hierome* saies it was done *apud Acta*, in the Scripture, therefore by Gods Holy Spirit, and the end he also specifies, *viz.* for the honour of that sacred order, *non propter legis necessitatem, not that there is any necessity of law*, that confirmation should be administred by the *Bishop*. Not that a Priest may doe it, but that, as S. *Hierome* himselfe there argues, the Holy Ghost being already given in baptisme, if it happens that *Bishops* may not be had (for he puts the case concerning persons in bondage, and places remote, and destitute of *Bishops*) then in that case there is not the absolute necessity of a Law, that Confirmation should be had at all: A man does not perish if he have it not; for that this thing was reserved to a *Bishops* peculiar ministration, was indeed an honour to the function, but it was not for the necessity of a Law tying people in all cases actually to acquire it. So that this [*non necessarium*] is not to be referred to the *Bishops* ministration, as if it were not necessary for him to doe it when it is to be done, not that a Priest may doe it if a *Bishop* may not be had; but this *non necessity* is to be referred to confirmation it selfe; so that

if

if a *Bishop* cannot be had, confirmation, though with much losse, yet with no danger, may be omitted. This is the summe of S. *Hieroms* discourse, this reconciles him to himselfe, this makes him speak conformably to his first assertions, and consequently to his arguments; and to be sure, no exposition can make these words to intend that this reservation of the power of confirmation to *Bishops*, is not done by the spirit of God, and then let the sense of the words be what they will, they can doe no hurt to the cause; and as easily may we escape from those words of his, to *Rusticus Bishop of Narbona. Sed quia scriptum est, Presbyteri duplici honore honorentur .... prædicare eos decet, utile est benedicere, congruum confirmare, &c.* It is quoted by *Gratian dist. 95. can. ecce ego.* But the glosse upon the place expounds him thus, *i. e. in fide*, the *Presbyters* may preach, they may confirme their Auditors, not by consignation of Chrisme, but by confirmation of faith; and for this, quotes a paralell place for the use of the word [*Confirmare*] by authority of S. *Gregory*, who sent *Zachary* his legate into *Germany* from the See of *Rome*, *ut Orthodoxos Episcopos, Presbyteros, vel quoscunq; reperire potuisset in verbo exhortationis perfectos, amplius confirmaret.* Certainly S. *Gregory* did not intend that his legate *Zachary* should confirme *Bishops* & *Priests* in any other sense but this of S. *Hieroms* in the present, to wit, in faith and doctrine, not in rite, and mystery, and neither could S. *Hierome* himselfe intend that Presbyters should doe it at all but in this sense

Caus. 11. q. 3. can. Quod prædecessor.

of S. *Gregory*, for else he becomes an *Antistrephon*, and his owne opposite.

in Ephes. 4. * Yea, but there is a worse matter then this. S. *Ambrose* tels of the *Egyptian* Priests, that they in the absence of the *Bishop* doe confirme. *Denique apud Egyptum Presbyteri consignant si præsens non sit Episcopus.* But,

1. The passage is suspitious, for it interrupts a discourse of S. *Ambrose's* concerning the Primitive Order of election to the *Bishopricke*, and is no way pertinent to the discourse, but is incircled with a story of a farre different consequence, which is not easily thought to have beene done by any considering and intelligent Author.

2. But suppose the clause is not surreptitious, but naturall to the discourse, and borne with it, yet it is matter of fact, not of right, for S. *Ambrose* neither approves, nor disproves it, and so it must goe for a singular act against the Catholike practise and Lawes of Christendome.

3. If the whole clause be not surreptitious, yet the word [*Consignant*] is, for *S. Austin* who hath the same discourse, the same thing, viz: of the dignity of *Presbyters*, tels this story of the Act and honour of *Presbyters in Alexandria*, and all *Ægypt*, almost in the other words of his Master S. *Ambrose*, but he tells it thus, *Nam & in Alexandriâ & per totum Ægyptum si desit Episcopus, Consecrat Presbyter.* So that it should not be *consignat*, but *consecrat*; for no story tells of any confirmations done in *Ægypt* by *Presbyters*, but of consecrating the

Quæst. 101. Vet. & N. Testam. Basileæ.

Eucharist

Eucharist in cases of *Episcopall* absence, or commission I shall give account in the Question of Iurisdiction; that was indeed permitted in *Ægypt*, and some other places, but Confirmation never, that we can find else where, and this is too improbable to beare weight against evidence and practise *Apostolicall*, and foure *Councells*, and 16 ancient *Catholike Fathers*, testifying that it was a *practise* and a *Law of Christendome* that *Bishops* onely should confirme, and not Priests, so that if there be no other scruple, this Question is quickly at an end.

* * But S. *Gregory* is also pretended in objection; for he gave dispensation to the Priests of *Sardinia*, *vt baptizatos Vguant*, to aneale baptized people. Now anointing the forehead of the baptized person, was one of the solemnityes of confirmation, so that this indulgence does arise to a power of Confirming; for *Vnctio* and *Chrismatio* in the first *Arausican Councell*, and since that time *Sacramentum Chrismatis* hath beene the vsuall word for confirmation. But this will not much trouble the buisinesse. *lib. 3. epist. 26.*

Because it is evident that he meanes it not of confirmation, but of the Chrisme in those times by the rites of the Church us'd in baptisme. For in his 9th *Epistle* he forbids Priests to anoynt baptized people, now here is precept against precept, therefore it must be understood of severall anoyntings, and so *S. Gregory* expounds himselfe in this 9th *Epistle*, *Presbyteri baptizatos infantes signare bis in fronte Chrismate non præsumant. Presbyters may not a-*

noynt baptised people twice, oncethey might; now that this permission of anoynting was that which was a ceremony of baptisme, not an act of confirmation, we shall see by comparing it with other *Canons*. * In the collection of the Orientall Canons by *Martinus Bracarensis*, It is decreed thus, [*Presbyter præsente Episcopo non* SIGNET *infantes, nisi forte ab Episcopo fuerit illi præceptum. A Priest must not signe infantes without leave of the Bishop if he be present. Must not signe them*] that is with Chrisme in their foreheads, and that in baptisme; for the circumstant Canons doe expresly explicate, and determine it; for they are concerning the rites of baptisme, and this in the midst of them. And by the way this may answer S. *Ambrose* his [*Presbyteri consignant absente Episcopo*] in case it be so to be read; for here wee see a consignation permitted to the presbyters in the Easterne Churches to be used in baptisme, in the absence of the Bishop, and this an act of indulgence and favour, and therefore extraordinary, and of use to *S. Ambrose* his purpose of advancing the Presbyters, but yet of no objection in case of confimation. * And indeed [*Consignari*] is us'd in Antiquity for any signing with the Crosse, and anealing. Thus it is us'd in the first *Arausican Councell* for *extreame Vnction*, which is there in case of extreame necessity permitted to *Presbyters: Hæreticos in mortis discrimine positos, Si Catholici esse desiderent, si desit Episcopus à Presbyteris cum Chrismate, & benedictione* CONSIGNARI *placet. Consign'd* is the word, and it was clearly in extreame Unction,

Can. 52.

Can. 2.

ction, for that rite was not then ceased, and it was in anealing a dying body, and a part of reconciliation, and so limited by the sequent Canon and not to be fancyed of any other consignation. But I returne. *** The first Councell of *Toledo* prohibites any from making Chrisme, but *Bishops* only, and takes order, *ut de singulis Ecclesiis ad Episcopum ante diem Paschæ Diaconi destinentur, ut confectum Chrisma ab Episcopo destinatum ad diem Paschæ possit occurrere*; that the Chrisme be fetch't by the Deacons from the *Bishop* to be us'd in all Churches. But for what use? why, it was *destinatum ad diem Paschæ* sayes the *Canon*, against the Holy time of *Easter*, and then, at *Easter* was the solemnity of publike baptismes, so that it was to be us'd in baptisme. And this sense being premised, the *Canon* permits to *Presbyters* to signe with Chrisme, the same thing that *S. Gregory* did to the *Priests of Sardinia*. *Statutum verò est, Diaconum non Chrismare, sed Presbyterum absente Episcopo, præsente verò, si ab ipso fuerit præceptum.* Now although this be evident enough, yet it is somthing clearer in the first *Arausican Councell*, *Nullus ministrorum qui* BAPTIZANDI *recipit officium sine Chrismate usquam debet progredi, quia inter nos placuit semel in baptismate Chrismari.* The case is evident that Chrismation or Consigning with oyntment was us'd in baptisme, and it is as evident that this Chrismation was it which *S. Gregory* permitted to the *Presbyters*, not the other, for he expressely forbad the other and the exigence of the *Canons*, and *practise of the Church*

Can. 20.

Can. 1.

Church expound it so, and it is the same which *S. Innocent* the first decreed in more expresse and distinctive termes, *Presbyteris Chrismate baptizatos ungere licet, sed quod ab Episcopo fuerit Consecratum*; there is a cleare permission of consigning with Chrisme in baptisme, but he subjoynes a prohibition to Priests for doing it in confirmation; *non tamen frontem eodem oleo signare, quod solis debetur Episcopis cùm tradunt Spiritum Sanctum Paracletum.*

Epist. 1 ad Decent. Cap. 3.

By the way; some, that they might the more clearly determine *S. Gregory's* dispensation to be only in baptismall Chrisme, read it, [*Vt baptizandos ungant*] not [*baptizatos*] so *Gratian*, so *S. Thomas*, but it is needlesse to be troubled with that, for *Innocentius* in the decretall now quoted useth the word [*Baptizatos*] and yet clearly distinguishes this power from the giving the Chrisme in Confirmation.

I know no other objection, and these wee see hinder not but that having such evidence of fact in Scripture of confirmations done only by *Apostles*, and this evidence urged by the Fathers for the practice of the Church, and the power of cofirmation by many Councells, and Fathers *appropriated* to *Bishops*, and denyed to *Presbyters*, and in this they are not only Doctors teaching their owne opinion, but witnesses of a Catholike practise, and doe actually attest it as done by a Catholike consent; and no *one example in all antiquity* ever produc'd of any *Priest* that *did*, *no law* that a *Priest might impose hands for confirmation*; wee may conclude it to be a power

power *Apostolicall* in the *Originall*, *Episcopall* in the *Succession*, and that in this power, the order of a *Bishop* is *higher* then that of a *Presbyter*, and so declar'd by this instance of *Catholike Practise*.

THus farre I hope we are right. But I call to mind, that in the *Nosotrophium* of the old Philosopher that undertook to cure all Calentures by Bathing his Patients in water; some were up to the Chin, some to the Middle, some to the Knees; So it is amongst the enemies of the Sacred Order of *Episcopacy*; some endure not the Name, and they indeed deserve to be over head and eares; some will have them all one in office with Presbyters, as at first they were in Name; and they had need bath up to the Chinne; but some stand shallower, and grant a little distinction, a precedency perhaps for order sake, but no preheminence in reiglement, no superiority of Iurisdiction; Others by all meanes would be thought to be quite thorough in behalfe of *Bishops* order, and power such as it is, but call for a reduction to the primitive state, and would have all Bishops like the Primitive, but becaus by this meanes they thinke to impaire their power, they may well endure to be up to the ankles, their error indeed is lesse, and their pretence fairer, but the use they make of it, of very ill consequence. But curing the mistake will quickly cure this distemper, That then shall be the present issue, that in the *Primitive Church Bishops* had more power, and greater exercise of absolute jurisdiction, then now Men § 34. And jurisdiction.

will endure to be granted, or then themselves are very forward to challenge.

Which they expressed in attributes of authority, and great power,

1. Then; The Primitive Church expressing the calling and offices of a *Bishop*, did it in termes of presidency and authority. *Episcopus typum Dei Patris omnium gerit*, saith *S. Ignatius*; *The Bishop carryes the representment of God the Father*, that is, in power and authority to be sure, (for how else?) so as to be the supreme *in suo ordine*, in offices Ecclesiasticall. And againe, *Quid enim aliud est Episcopus quàm is qui omni Principatu, & potestate superior est?* Here his superiority and advantage is expressed to be in his power; A *Bishop* is greater and higher then all other power, viz. *in materiâ*, or *gradu religionis*. And in his Epistle to the *Magnesians*; *Hortor ut hoc sit omnibus studium in Dei concordiâ omnia agere* EPISCOPO PRAESIDENTE LOCO DEI. *Doe all things in Vnity, the Bishop being* PRESIDENT IN THE PLACE OF GOD. President in all things. And with a fuller title yet, in his Epistle to the Church of *Smyrna*, *Honora Episcopum ut* PRINCIPEM SACERDOTUM *imaginem Dei referentem, Dei quidem propter Principatum, Christi verò propter Sacerdotium.* It is full of fine expression both for Eminency of order, and Iurisdiction. The *Bishop is the* PRINCE OF THE PRIESTS *bearing the image of God for his Principality* (that's his *jurisdiction* and power) but of Christ himselfe for his Priesthood, (that's his *Order*.) S. *Ignatius* hath spoken fairely, and if we consider that he was so *primitive a man* that himselfe *saw Christ* in the flesh, and

Epist. ad Trallian.

liv'd

liv'd a man of exemplary sanctity, and dyed a Martyr, and hath been honoured as holy Catholike by all posterity, certainly these testimonyes must needs be of Great pressure, being *Sententiæ repetiti dogmatis*, not casually slipt from him, and by incogitancy, but resolutely and frequently.

But this is attested by the generall expressions of after ages. *Fungaris circa eum* POTESTATE HONORIS *tui*, saith S. *Cyprian to Bishop Rogatianus*. Execute the POWER OF THY DIGNITY upon the refractary *Deacon*; And VIGOR EPISCOPALIS, and AUTHORITAS CATHEDRÆ are the the words expressive of that power whatsoever it be which S. *Cyprian* calls upon him to assert, in the same Epistle. This is high enough. So is that which he presently subjoynes, calling the *Bishops power Ecclesiæ gubernandæ sublimem ac divinam potestatem*, *a high and a divine power and authority in regiment of the Church*. * *Locus Magisterij traditus ab Apostolis*, So S. *Irenæus* calls *Episcopacy*; *A place of Mastership or authority deliver'd by the Apostles to the* Bishops *their successors*. * *Eusebius* speaking of *Dionysius*, who succeeded *Heraclas*, he received (saith he) τῆς προεδρίας τῶν κατ' Ἀλεξάνδρειαν ἐκκλησιῶν τῷ ἐπισκοπῷ. The *Bishoprick of the* PRECEDENCY *over the Churches of Alexandria*. * εἰς τὸν ἀρχιδιάκονον τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς, saith the Councell of *Sardis*, *to the* TOP *or* HEIGHT *of Episcopacy*. APICES *&* PRINCIPES OMNIUM, so *Optatus* calls *Bishops*; *the* CHEIFE, *and* HEAD *of all*; and S. *Denys* of *Alexandria*, *Scribit ad Fabianum Vrbis Romæ Episcopum, & ad alios quamplurimos*

lib. 3. epist. 9.

lib. 4. cap. 63.

lib. 6. hist. cap. 26.

Can. 10.

lib. 2. adv. Parmen.

ECCLESIARUM PRINCIPES *de fide Catholicâ suâ,* faith *Eusebius.* And *Origen* calls the *Bishop*, *eum qui* TOTIUS ECCLESIÆ ARCEM *obtinet*, *He that hath obtayn'd the* TOWER OR HEIGHT *of the Church.*

lib. 6. hist. cap. 26.

Homil. 7. in Ierem.

The Fathers of the Councell of *Constantinople in Trullo* ordayn'd that the *Bishops* dispossessed of their Churches by incroachments of Barbarous people upon the Church's pale, so as the *Bishop* had in effect no Dioceſſe, yet they should enjoy τὴν τῆς προεδρίας εὐθυντήριαν κατὰ τὸν ἴδιον λόγον *the authority of their* PRESIDENCY *according to their proper state*; their appropriate presidency. And the same *Councell* calls the *Bishop* ὁ τῆς πόλεως προεδρεύων *the* PRELATE *or* PREFECT *of the Church*; I know not how to expound it better. But it is something more full in the Greeks Councell of *Carthage* Commanding that the convert *Donatists* should be received according to the will and pleasure of the *Bishop*, ἵνα ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ τόπῳ κυβερνῶν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, *that* GOVERNES *the Church in that place.* * And in the Councell of *Antioch* ἐπίσκοπον ἔχειν τὴν τῆς ἐκκλησίας πραγμάτων ἐξουσίαν, *The Bishop hath* POWER OVER *the affayrs of the Church.* * *Hoc quidem tempore Romanæ Ecclesiæ Sylvester retinacula gubernabat.* S. *Sylvester* [*the Bishop*] *held the Reynes or the stearne of the Roman Church, saith Theodoret.*

Can. 69.

Can. 25.

hist: tripart: lib. 1. cap. 12.

But the instances of this kind are infinite, two may be as good as twenty, and these they are. The first is of S. *Ambrose*; HONOR, *&* SUBLIMITAS *Episcopalis nullis poterit comparationibus adæquari. The* HONOUR *and* SUBLIMITY *of the Episcopall Or-*

de dignit. sacerdot. c. 2.

der

der is beyond all compariſon great. And their commiſſion he ſpecifyes to be in *Paſce oves meas*; *Vnde regendæ Sacerdotibus contraduntur, meritò* RECTORIBUS *ſuis ſubdi dicuntur* &c: *The ſheepe are delivered to Biſhops, as to* RULERS *and are made their Subjects*; And in the next chapter, *Hæc verò cuncta, Fratres, ideò nos præmiſiſſe cognoſcere debetis, vt oſtenderemus nihil eſſe in hoc ſæculo excellentius Sacerdotibus, nihil* SUBLIMIUS EPISCOPIS *reperiri: vt cùm dignitatem Epiſcopatûs Epiſcoporum oraculis demonſtramus, & dignè noſcamus quid ſumus .... actione potius, quàm Nomine demonſtremus. Theſe things I have ſaid that you may know nothing is higher, nothing more excellent then the* DIGNITY, AND EMINENCE OF A BISHOP, &c. Cap. 3. * The other is of S. *Hierome*, CURA TOTIUS ECCLESIÆ AD EPISCOPUM PERTINET, The care of the whole Church appertaines to the *Biſhop*. But more confidently ſpoken is that in his dialogue *adverſus Luciferianos*; *Eccleſiæ ſalus in* SUMMI SACERDOTIS DIGNITATE *pendet, cui ſi non exors quædam & ab omnibus* EMINENS DETUR POTESTAS, *tot in Eccleſiis efficientur ſchiſmata, quot Sacerdotes, The ſafety of the Church conſiſts in the* DIGNITY OF A BISHOP, *to whom vnleſſe an* EMINENT *and* UNPARALELL'D POWER *be given by all, there will be as many Schiſmes as Prieſts.* Cap. 4.

Here is *dignity*, and *authority*, and *power* enough expreſſed; and if words be expreſſive of things, (and there is no other uſe of thē) then the *Biſhop* is SUPERIOUR IN A PEERELESSE, AND INCOMPARABLE

AUTHORITY, and all the whole Dioceſſe are his ſubjects, viz: *in regimine Spirituali.*

§ 35. Requiring Vniverſall obedience to be given to Biſhops by Clergy and Laity.

BUT from words let us paſſe to things. For the Faith and practiſe of Chriſtendome requires obedience, Univerſall obedience, to be given to *Biſhops*. I will begin againe with *Ignatius*, that theſe men who call for reduction of *Epiſcopacy* to Primitive conſiſtence, may ſee what they gaine by it, for the more primitive the teſtimonies are, the greater exaction of obedience to Biſhops; for it happened in this, as in all other things; at firſt, Chriſtians were more devout more purſuing of their duties, more zealous in atteſtation of every particle of their faith; and that *Epiſcopacy* is now come to ſo low an ebbe, it is nothing, but that it being a great part of Chriſtianity to honour, and obey them, it hath the fate of all other parts of our Religion, and particularly of Charity, come to ſo low a declenſion, as it can ſcarce ſtand alone; and faith, which ſhall ſcarce be found upon earth at the comming of the Sonne of Man.

But to our buſineſſe.

S. *Ignatius* in his epiſtle to the Church of *Trallis*, *Neceſſe itaq; eſt* (ſaith he) *quicquid facitis, ut ſine* EPISCOPO NIHIL TENTETIS. So the *Latine* of *Vedelius*, which I the rather chuſe, becauſe I am willing to give all the advantage I can. *It is neceſſary* (ſaith the good *Martyr*) *that whatſoever ye doe, you ſhould attempt nothing without your* BISHOP. And to the *Magneſians*, *Decet itaq; vos obedire* EPISCOPO,

PISCOPO, ET IN NULLO ILLI REFRAGARI. *It is fitting that ye should obey your* BISHOP, *and in* NOTHING *to be refractory to him.* Here is both a *Decet*, and a *Necesse est*, already. *It is very fitting, it is necessary.* But if it be possible, we have a fuller expression yet, in the same Epistle; *Quemadmodum enim Dominus sine Patre nihil facit, nec enim possum facere à me ipso quicquam: sic & vos* SINE EPISCOPO, *nec Presbyter, nec Diaconus, nec Laicus. Nec* QUICQUAM *videatur* VOBIS CONSENTANEUM *quod sit* PRÆTER ILLIUS IUDICIUM, *quod enim tale est, iniquum est, & Deo inimicum.* Here is obedience Vniversall, both in respect of things, and persons; and all this no lesse then absolutely necessary. *For as Christ obey'd his Father in all things, "saying, of my selfe I can doe nothing: so nor you "without your* BISHOP; *whoever you be, whether "Priest, or Deacon, or Lay-man. Let nothing please "you, which the Bishop mislikes, for all such things "are wicked, and in enmity with God.* * But it seems S. *Ignatius* was mightily in love with this precept, for he gives it to almost all the Churches he writes to. Wee have already reckon'd the *Trallians*, and the *Magnesians*. But the same he gives to the Priests of *Tarsus*, οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ὑποτασσέσθωσαν ὀπισκόπῳ. *Ye Presbyters be subject to your Bishop.* The same to the *Philadelphians. Sine* EPISCOPO *nihil facite, Doe nothing without your* BISHOP. But this is better explicated in his Epistle to the Church of *Smyrna. Sine* EPISCOPO NEMO QUICQUAM FACIAT *eorum quæ ad Ecclesiam spectant. No man may doe* ANY THING

THING WITHOUT THE BISHOP, *viz.* of those things which belong to the Church. So that this saying expounds all the rest, for this universall obedience is to be understood according to the sense of the Church, *viz.* to be in all things of Ecclesiasticall cognizance, all Church affaires. And therefore he gives a charge to S. *Polycarpe* their *Bishop*; that he also look to it, that nothing be done without his leave. *Nihil sine* TUO ARBITRIO *agatur, nec item tu quicquam præter Dei facies voluntatem. As thou must doe nothing against Gods will, so let nothing* (in the Church) *be done without thine.* By the way, observe, he saies not, that as the *Presbytery* must doe nothing without the *Bishop*, so the *Bishop* nothing without them; But, so the *Bishop* nothing without *God*. But so it is. *Nothing must* BE DONE *without the Bishop*; And therefore although he incourages them that can, to remaine in Virginity, yet this, if it be either done with pride, or without the *Bishop*, it is spoiled. For, *si gloriatus fuerit, periit, & si id ipsum statuatur* SINE EPISCOPO, *corruptum est*. His last dictate in this Epistle to S. *Polycarpe*, is with an [*Episcopo attendite, sicut & Deus vobis*] The way to have God to take care of us, is to observe our Bishop. *Hinc & vos decet accedere* SENTENTIÆ EPISCOPI, *qui secundùm Deum vos pascit, quemadmodum & facitis, edocti à spiritu; you must therefore conforme to the sentence of the* BISHOP, *as indeed yee doe already, being taught so to doe by Gods holy Spirit.*

Epist. ad Ephes.

There needs no more to be said in this cause, if the

the authority of so great a man will beare so great a burden. What the man was, I said before: what these Epistles are, and of what authority, let it rest upon * *Vedelius*, a man who is no waies to be suspected as a party for *Episcopacy*, or rather upon the credit of [a] *Eusebius*, [b] S. *Hierome*, and [c] *Ruffinus* who reckon the first seven out of which I have taken these *excerpta*, for naturall and genuine. And now I will make this use of it; Those men that call for reduction of *Episcopacy* to the Primitive state, should doe well to stand close to their principles, and count that the best *Episcopacy* which is first; and then consider but what S. *Ignatius* hath told us for direction in this affaire, and see what is gotten in the bargaine. For my part, since they that call for such a reduction hope to gaine by it, and then would most certainly have abidden by it, I think it not reasonable to abate any thing of *Ignatius* his height, but expect such subordination and conformity to the *Bishop* as he then knew to be a *law of Christianity*. But let this be remembred all along, in the specification of the parts of their Iurisdiction. But as yet I am in the generall demonstration of obedience.

* *Apologia pro Ignatio.*
a *Lib. 3. hist. c. 30.*
b *De Script. Eccles.*
c *Apud Euseb. quem Latinè reddidit.*

The Councell of *Laodicea* having specified some particular instances of *subordination*, and *dependance to the Bishop*, summes them up thus, * ὡσάυτως δὲ καὶ τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους μηδὲν ποιεῖν ἄνευ γνώμης τοῦ ἐπισκόπου. *So likewise the Presbyters let them doe nothing without the precept and counsell of the Bishop*, so is the translation of *Isidore*, *ad verbum*. This Councell is anci-

Can. 56.

* *Idem videre est apud Damasum. Epist. de Chorepiscopis.*

ent enough, for it was before the first *Nicene*. So also was that of *Arles* commanding the same thing exactly. * *Vt Presbyteri sine conscientiâ Episcoporum nihil faciant. Sed nec Presbyteris civitatis sine Episcopi præcepto amplius aliquid imperare, vel sine authoritate literarum ejus in Vnaquaq; parochiâ aliquid agere*, saies the *thirteenth Canon* of the *Ancyran Councell* according to the Latine of *Isidore*. The same thing is in the first Councell of *Toledo*, the very same words for which I cited the first Councell of *Arles*, *viz*. *That Presbyters doe nothing without the knowledge or permission of the Bishop.* * *Esto* Subjectus Pontifici Tuo, *& quasi animæ parentem suscipe*. It is the counsell of S. *Hierome*. *Be subject to thy Bishop and receive him as the Father of thy soule.*

Can. 19.

Can. 20.

Epist. ad Nepotian.

I shall not need to derive hither any more particular instances of the duty, and obedience owing from the *Laity* to the *Bishop*. For this account will certainly be admitted by all considering men. God hath intrusted the soules of the Laity to the care of the Ecclesiasticall orders; they therefore are to submit to the government of the *Clergy* in matters *Spirituall* with which they are intrusted. For either there is no Government at all, or the *Laity* must governe the Church, or else the *Clergy* must. To say there is no Government, is to leave the Church in worse condition then a tyranny. To say that the Laity should governe the Church, when all Ecclesiasticall Ministeries are committed to the Clergy, is to say, Scripture means not what it saies; for it is to

to say, that the Clergy must be *Præpositi*, and προεστῶτες, and *prælati*, and yet the prelation, and presidency, and rule is in them who are not ever by Gods spirit called Presidents or Prelates, and that it is not in them who are called so. * In the mean time if the Laity in matters Spirituall are inferior to the Clergy, and must in things pertaining to the Soule be rul'd by them, with whom their Soules are intrusted; then also much rather they must obey those of the Clergy, to whom all the other Clergy themselves are bound to be obedient. Now since by the frequent precept of so many Councells, and Fathers, the Deacons and Presbyters must submit in all things to the *Bishop*, much more must the Laity, and since the *Bishop* must rule in chiefe, and the Presbyters at the most can but rule in conjunction, and assistance, but ever in subordination to the *Bishop*, the Laity must obey *de integro*. For that is to keep them in that state, in which God hath placed them.

But for the maine, S. *Clement* in his Epistle to S. *Iames* translated by *Ruffinus*, saith it was the doctrine of *Peter*, according to the institution of *Christ*, *that Presbyters should be obedient to their Bishop in all things*; and in his third Epistle; *that Presbyters, and Deacons and others of the Clergy must take heed that they doe nothing without the license of the Bishop.* * And to make this businesse up compleat, all these authorities of great antiquity, were not the prime constitutions in those severall Churches respectively, but meere derivations from tradition *Apostolicall*

call; for not only the thing, but the words so often mentioned are in the 40th *Canon* of the *Apostles*. οἱ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ διάκονοι ἄνευ γνώμης τοῦ Ἐπισκόπου μηδὲν ἐπιτελείτωσαν (the same is repeated in the twenty fourth Canon of the *Councell of Antioch*) αὐτῷ γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ πεπιστευμένος τὸν λαὸν τοῦ Κυρίου, καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν ψυχῶν αὐτῶν λόγον ἀπαιτητέος. *Presbyters and Deacons must doe nothing without leave of the Bishop, for to him the Lords people is committed, and he must give an account for their soules.* * And if a Presbyter shall contemne his owne Bishop making conventions apart, and erecting another altar, he is to be deposed, ὡς φιλαρχος (saith the 32. Canon) *as a lover of Principality*: intimating, that he arrogates Episcopall dignity, and so is ambitious of a Principality. The issue then is this. * The Presbyters, and Clergy, and Laity must obey, therefore the Bishop must governe and give them lawes. It was particularly instanc'd in the case of S. *Chrysostome*, καὶ πῶς παιδεύων τοὺς κατηκόους τοῖς νόμοις saith *Theodoret*, *He adorned, and instructed Pontus with these Lawes*, so he, reckoning up the extent of his jurisdiction.

Lib. 5. cap. 28.

* But now descend we to a specification of the power and jurisdiction * of *Bishops*.

§ 36. Appointing them to be Iudges of the Clergy and spirituall causes of the Laity.

THE *Bishops* were Ecclesiastical Iudges over the Presbyters, the inferiour Clergy and the Laity. What they were in Scripture who were constituted in presidency over causes spirituall, I have already twice explicated; and from hence it descended by a close succession that they who watched for soules

soules they had the rule over them, and because no regiment can be without coërcion, therefore there was inherent in them a power of cognition of causes, and coërcion of persons. * The *Canons* of the *Apostles* appointing censures to be inflicted on delinquent person's makes the Bishop's hand to doe it. Ἐι τις πρεσβύτερος, ἢ διάκονος ὑπὸ ἐπισκόπου γένηται ἀφωρισμένος, τοῦτον μὴ ἐξεῖναι παρ' ἑτέρῳ δέχεσθαι, ἀλλ' ἢ παρὰ ἀφορίσαντος αὐτὸν, εἰ μὴ ἀποθάνοι ὁ ἀφορίσας αὐτὸν Ἐπίσκοπος. *If any Presbyter or Deacon be excommunicated* By The Bishop *he must not be received by any else, but by him that did so censure him, unlesse the* Bishop That Censur'd Him *be dead.* The same is repeated in the *Nicene Councell*; only it is permitted that any one may appeale to a *Synod of* Bishops, *si fortè aliquâ indignatione, aut contentione aut qualibet commotione Episcopi sui, excommunicati sint*, if he thinks himselfe wrong'd by prejudice or passion; and when the Synod is met, *hujusmodi examinent Quæstiones*. But by the way it must be *Synodus Episcoporum*, so the Canon; *ut ita demum hi qui ob culpas suas* Episcoporum Suorum Offensas *meritò contraxerunt dignè etiam à cæteris excommunicati habeantur, quousq; in communi, vel* Ipsi Episcopo Suo Visum Fuerit *humaniorum circà eos ferre sententiam*. The Synod of Bishops must ratifie the excommunication of all those who for their delinquencies have justly incurred the displeasure of their *Bishop*, and this censure to stick upon them till either the Synod, or their owne Bishop shall give a more gentle sentence. * * This *Canon*

Can. 33.

Can. 5.

we see, relates to the *Canon of the Apostles*, and affixes the judicature of Priests, and Deacons to the *Bishops:* commanding their censures to be held as firme and valid; only as the *Apostles Canon* names Presbyters, and Deacons particularly; so the *Nicene Canon* speakes indefinitely and so comprehends all of the Dioceſſe and juriſdiction.

Can. 59. The fourth *Councell of Carthage* gives in expreſſe termes the cogniſance of Clergy-cauſes to the Biſhop, calling ayd from a Synod in caſe a Clergy-man prove refractary, and diſobedient. *Diſcordantes Clericos Episcopus vel ratione, vel poteſtate ad concordiam trahat, inobedientes Synodus per audientiam damnet. If the Biſhops reaſon will not end the controverſies of Clergy-men, his power muſt;* but if any man liſt to be contentious, intimating (as I ſuppoſe out of the *Nicene Councell*) with frivolous appeales, and impertinent protraction, the Synod [of *Biſhops*] muſt condemne him, *viz.* for his diſobeying his *Biſhops* ſentence. * The *Councell of Antioch* is yet more particular in it's Sanction for this affayre, intimating a cleare diſtinction of proceeding in the cauſes of a Biſhop, and the other of Prieſts, and Deacons.

Can. 4. εἰ τὶς Ἐπίσκοπος ὑπὸ συνόδε καθαιρεθείς, ἢ πρεσβύτερος ἢ διάκονος ὑπὸ τῦ ἰδίε Ἐπισκόπε &c. *If a Biſhop ſhall be depoſed by a Synod* (*viz.* of *Biſhops*, according to the exigence of the *Nicene Canon*) *or a* Priest, Or Deacon By His Owne Bishop, if he meddles with any Sacred offices he ſhall be hopeleſſe of abſolution. But here we ſee that the ordinary Iudge of a Biſhop is a *Synod of Biſhops*; but of Prieſts and Deacons

cons the Bishop alone: And the sentence of the *Bishop* is made firme *omnimodò* in the next Canon; *Si quis Presbyter, vel Diaconus proprio contempto* Episcopo.... *privatim congregationem effecerit, & altare erexerit, & Episcopo accersente non obedierit nec velit ei parere, nec morem gerere primò & secundò vocanti, hic damnetur omni modo..... Quod si Ecclesiam conturbare, & sollicitare persistat tanquam seditiosus per potestates exteras opprimatur. What Presbyter soever refuses to obey his Bishop and will not appeare at his first, or second Summons, let him be deposed, and if he shall persist to disturbe the Church, let him be given over to the secular powers.* * Adde to this the first *Canon* of the same Councell, εἴ τις ὑπὸ τοῦ ἰδίου Ἐπισκόπου ἀκοινώνητος γένοιτο &c: *If any one be excommunicate by his owne* Bishop &c: as it is in the foregoing *Canons* of *Nice* and the *Apostles*. The Result of these Sanctions is this. The *Bishop* is the *Iudge*: the *Bishop* is to inflict censures; the *Presbyters*, and *Deacons* are either to obey, or to be deposed: No greater evidence in the world of a Superiour jurisdiction, and this established by all the power they had; and this did extend, not only to the *Clergy*, but to the *Laity*; for that's the close of the *Canon*, ὁ αὐτὸς καὶ ὅρος ὅσοι λαϊκῶν, καὶ πρεσβυτέρων, καὶ διακόνων, καὶ παντὸς τοῦ ἐν τῷ κανόνι. *This "constitution is concerning the Laity, and the Pres- "byters, and the Deacons, and all that are within the "rule, viz: that if their Bishop have sequestred them "from the holy Communion, they must not be suffered "to communicate elsewhere.*

But the AUDIENTIA EPISCOPALIS, *The Bishops Audience*

Audience-Court is of larger power in the *Councell of*
Can. 9. *Chalcedon*, Εἴ τις κληρικὸς πρὸς κληρικὸν πρᾶγμα ἔχοι, μὴ καταλιμπανέτω τὸν ἰδιωτικὸν ἐπίσκοπον, καὶ ἐπὶ κοσμικὰ δικαστήρια καταφεύγετω. *If any Clergy man have any cause against a Clergy man, let him by no meanes leave his owne* Bishop *and runne to* Secular Courts, ἀλλὰ πρότερον τὰ ὑπόθεσιν γυμναζέτω πρὸ τοῦ ἰδίου Ἐπισκόπου, ἢ γοῦν γνώμη αὐτοῦ τοῦ Ἐπισκόπου παρ' οἷς ἂν τὰ ἀμφότερα μέρη βούλεται, τὰ τῆς δίκης συνεξετάζω. *But first let the cause be examined before their owne* Bishop, *or by the* Bishops leave *before such persons as the contesting parties shall desire.* εἰ δέ τις πρᾶξαι ταῦτα ποιήσει, κανονικοῖς ὑποκείσθω ἐπιτιμίοις. *Whosoever does otherwise let him suffer under the censures of the Church.* Here is not only a subordination of the *Clergy* in matters *criminall*, but also the *civill causes of the* Clergy must be submitted to the *Bishop*, under paine of the *Canon*. * I end this with the attestation of the *Councell of Sardis*, exactly of the same Spirit, the same injunction, and almost the same words with the former *Canons*. *Ho-*
Can. 13, & 14. *sius* the President said; If any *Deacon*, or *Priest*, or of the inferiour Clergy being excommunicated shall goe to another *Bishop* γινώσκοντα ἀποκεκινῆσθαι αὐτὸν τῆς κοινωνίας πρὸς τοῦ ἰδίου ἐπισκόπου, *knowing him to be excommunicated by his owne* Bishop, *that other Bishop, must by no meanes receive him into his communion.*

Thus farre we have matter of publike right, and authority declaring the *Bishop* to be the *Ordinary Iudge* of the causes, and persons of Clergy men; and have power of inflicting censures both upon the Clergy

Clergy, and the Laity. And if there be any weight in the concurrent testimony of the *Apostolicall Canons*, of the Generall Councells of *Nice*, and of *Chalcedon*, of the Councells of *Antioch*, of *Sardis*, of *Carthage*; then it is evident, that the *Bishop* is the Ordinary Iudge in all matters of Spirituall cognisance, and hath power of censures, and therefore a Superiority of jurisdiction.

This thing only by the way; in all these *Canons* there is no mention made of any *Presbyters assistant* with the *Bishop* in his Courts. For though I doubt not but the *Presbyters* were in some Churches, and in some times συνέδρια, and σύμβουλοι τοῦ Ἐπισκόπου as S. *Ignatius* calls them; *counsellors and assessors with the Bishop*; yet the power, and the right of inflicting censures is only expressed to be in the Bishop, and no concurrent jurisdiction mention'd in the Presbytery: but of this hereafter more particularly.

* Now we may see these Canons attested by practice, and dogmaticall resolution. S. *Cyprian* is the man whom I would choose in all the world to depose in this cause; because he, if any man, hath given all dues to the Colledge of Presbyters: and yet if he reserves the Superiority of jurisdiction to the *Bishop*, and that absolutely, and independently of conjunction with the Presbytery, we are all well enough, and without suspition. * *Diù patientiam meam tenui* (*Fratres Charissimi*) saith he, writing to the Presbyters and Deacons of his Church. He was angry with them for admitting the *lapsi* without his consent; and though he was as willing as a- Epist. 10.

ny man to comply both with the Clergy, and people of his Diocesse, yet he also must assert his owne priviledges, and peculiar. *Quod enim non periculum metuere debemus de offensâ Domini, quando aliqui de Presbyteris nec Evangelij nec loci sui memores, sed neq; futurum Domini judicium, neq; nunc præpositum sibi Episcopum cogitantes, quod nunquam omnino sub antecessoribus factum est ut cum cõtumeliâ & contemptu Præpositi totum sibi vendicarent.* The matter was, that certaine *Presbyters* had reconciled them that fell in persecution without the performance of penance according to the severity of the *Canon*; and this was done without the *Bishops* leave, by the *Presbyters* [*Forgetting their owne place and the* GOSPELL *and their* BISHOP *set over them*] a thing that was never heard of, till that time. *Totum sibi vendicabant*, They that might doe nothing without the *Bishops* leave, yet did this whole affaire of their owne heads. Well! Vpon this S. *Cyprian* himselfe, by his owne authority alone, suspends them till his returne, and so shewes that his authority was independant, theirs was not, and then promises they shall have a faire hearing before him, in the presence of the Confessors, and all the people. *Vt ea admonitione quâ me vti Dominus jubet, ut interim prohibeantur offerre, acturi & apud nos, & apud Confessores ipsos, & apud plebem Vniversam causam suam.* * Here it is plaine that S. *Cyprian* suspended these Presbyters, by his owne authority, in absence from his Church, and reserved the further hearing of the cause till it should please God to restore him to his See.

But

But this fault of the Presbyters S. *Cyprian* in the two next Epistles does still more exaggerate; saying, they ought to have ask'd the *Bishops* leave, *Sicut in præteritum semper sub antecessoribus factum est*, for so was the Catholike custome ever, that nothing should be done without the *Bishops* leave; but now by doing otherwise they did prevaricate the divine commandement, and dishonour the *Bishop*. Yea, but the Confessors interceeded for the *lapsi*, and they seldome were discountenanc'd in their requests. What should the Presbyters doe in this case? S. *Cyprian* tells them, writing to the Confessors. *Petitiones itaq; & desideria vestra* EPISCOPO *servent. Let them keepe your petitions for the* BISHOP *to consider of.* But they did not, therefore he suspended them, because they did not *reservare Episcopo honorem Sacerdotij sui, & cathedræ*; *Preserve the honour of the Bishops chaire, and the Episcopall authority in presuming to reconcile the penitents without the Bishops leave.* *Epist.* 11. *Epist.* 12.

The same S. *Cyprian* in his Epistle to *Rogatianus* resolves this affayre; for when a contemptuous bold *Deacon* had abus'd his *Bishop*, he complain'd to S. *Cyprian* who was an *Arch-Bishop*, and indeed S. *Cyprian* tells him he did honour him in the businesse that he would complaine to him, *cum pro* EPISCOPATUS VIGORE, *&* CATHEDRÆ AUTHORITATE *haberes potestatem quâ posses de illo statim vindicari*; *When as he had power Episcopall and sufficient authority himselfe to have punish'd the Deacon for his petulancy.* The whole Epistle is very perti- *Epist.* 65.

nent to this Question, and is cleare evidence for the great authority of *Episcopall jurisdiction*, the summe whereof is in this incouragement given to *Rogatianus* by S. *Cyprian*; *Fungaris circa eum* POTESTATE HONORIS TUI, *ut eum vel deponas, vel abstineas. Exercise the power of your honour upon him, and either suspend him, or depose him.* * And therefore he commends *Cornelius* the *Bishop* of *Rome* for driving *Felicissimus* the Schismatick from the Church *vigore pleno quo Episcopum agere oportet, with full authority, as becomes a Bishop.*

Epist. 55.

Socrates telling of the promotion, and qualities of S. *Iohn Chrysostome*, saies, that in reforming the lives of the Clergy, he was too fastuous and severe. *Mox igitur in ipso initio quum Clericis asper videretur Ecclesiæ, erat plurimis exosus, & veluti furiosum universi declinabant. He was so rigid in animadversions against the Clergy, that he was hated by them*; which clearely shewes that the *Bishop* had jurisdiction, and authority over them; for tyranny is the excesse of power, & authority is the subject matter of rigour, and austerity. But this power was intimated in that bold speech of his *Deacon Serapio, nunquam poteris, ô Episcope, hos corrigere, nisi uno baculo percusseris Universos. Thou canst not amend the Clergy unlesse thou strikest them all with thy Pastorall rod.* S. *Iohn Chrysostome* did not indeed doe so; but *non multum post temporis plurimos clericorum pro diversis exemit causis. He deprived, and suspended most of the Clergy men for diverse causes*: and for this his severity he wanted no slanders against him, for the delinquent

Tripart. hist. lib. 10. cap. 3.

quent Ministers set the people on work against him. * But here we see that the power of censures was clearely, and only in the *Bishop*, for he was incited to have punished all his Clergy, [*Vniversos*;] And he did actually suspend most of them, [*plurimos*:] and I think it will not be believed the Presbytery of his Church should joyne with their *Bishop* to supend themselves. Adde to this that *Theodoret* also affirmes that *Chrysostome* intreated the Priests to live Canonically according to the sanctions of the Church, *quas quicunq; prævaricari præsumerent eos ad templum prohibebat accedere*, ALL *them that transgressed the Canons he forbad them entrance into the Church.* *Ibid. cap. 4.*

*** Thus S. *Hierome* to *Riparius*, *Miror sanctum Epiſcopum, in cujus Parochiâ esse Presbyter dicitur, acquiescere furori ejus, & non virgâ* APOSTOLICA, *virgâq; ferreâ confringere vas inutile, & tradere in interitum carnis, ut spiritus salvus fiat. I wonder* (saith he) *that the holy Bishop is not mov'd at the fury of Vigilantius, and does not breake him with his* APOSTOLICALL *rod, that by this temporary punishment his soule might be saved in the day of the Lord.* * Hitherto the *Bishops* Pastorall staffe is of faire power and coërcion. *Adverſ. Vigilant. Epiſt. 53.*

The Councell of *Aquileia* convoked against the *Arians*, is full and mighty in asserting the *Bishops* power over the Laity, and did actually exercise censures upon the Clergy, where S. *Ambrose* was the Man that gave sentence against *Palladius* the *Arian*, *Palladius* would have declined the judgement of

the *Bishops*, for he saw he should certainly be condemned and would faine have been judg'd by some honourable personages of the Laity. But S. *Ambrose* said, *Sacerdotes de Laicis judicare debent, non Laici de Sacerdotibus. Bishops must judge of the Laity, not the Laity of Bishops.* That's for the *jus*; and for the *factum* it was the shutting up of the *Councell*; S. *Ambrose Bishop of Millaine* gave sentence [*Pronuncio illum indignum Sacerdotio, & carendum, & in loco ejus Catholicus ordinetur.*] * The same also was the case of *Marcellus Bishop of Ancyra in Galatia* whom for heresy the *Bishops* at *Constantinople* depos'd, *Eusebius* giving sentence, and chose *Basilius* in his Roome.

Tripart. hist. lib. 3. cap. 9.

* But their Grand-father was serv'd no better. *Alexander Bishop of Alexandria* serv'd him neither better nor worse. So *Theodoret. Alexander autem Apostolicorum dogmatum prædicator, prius quidem revocare eum admonitionibus, & consiliis nitebatur. Cùm verò eum superbire vidisset, & apertè impietatis facinora prædicare, ex ordine Sacerdotali removit. The Bishop first admonish'd the heretick, but when to his false doctrine he added pertinacy he deprived him of the execution of his Priestly function.*

Tripart. hist. lib. 1. c. 12.

This crime indeed deserv'd it highly. It was for a lesse matter that *Triferius* the *Bishop* excommunicated *Exuperantius* a *Presbyter viz.* for a personall misdemeanour, and yet this censure was ratified by the Councell of *Taurinum*, and his restitution was left *arbitrio Episcopi*, to the good will and pleasure of the *Bishop* who had censur'd him. *Statuit quod de*

Can. 4. Ann. Dom. 397.

de Exuperantio Presbytero sancta Synodus, qui ad injuriam sancti Episcopi sui Triferii gravia & multa congesserat, & frequentibus eum contumeliis provocaverat .... propter quam causam ab eo fuerat Dominicâ communione privatus, ut in ejus sit arbitrio restitutio ipsius, in cujus potestate eius fuit abjectio. His restitution was therefore left in his power, because originally his censure was. * The like was in the case of *Palladius* a Laick in the same *Councell, qui à Triferio Sacerdote fuerat mulctatus, who was punished by Triferius the Bishop; hoc ei humanitate Concilii reservato, ut ipse Triferius in potestate habeat, quando voluerit ei relaxare.*

Here is the *Bishop* censuring *Palladius* the Laick, and excommunicating *Exuperantius* the Priest, and this having been done by his own sole authority was ratified by the *Councell*, and the absolution reserv'd to the *Bishop* too, which indeed was an act of favour; for they having complain'd to the *Councell*, by the *Councell* might have been absolved, but they were pleased to reserve to the *Bishop* his owne power.

* These are particular instances, and made pub-
* like by acts conciliary intervening. But it was
* the *Generall Canon* and *Law* of H Church.

Thus we have it expressed in the *Councell of Agatho. Contumaces verò Clerici prout dignitatis ordo permiserit ab Episcopis corrigantur. Refractary Clerks must be punished by their Bishops, according as the order of their dignity allowes.* I end this particular with some *Canons* commanding Clerks to Cap. 2.

submit

submit to the judgement and censures of their *Bishop*, under a Canonicall penalty; and so goe on *ad alia*.

Ca. 8. In the second Councell of Carthage, *Alypius Episcopus dixit, nec illud prætermittendum est, ut si quis fortè Presbyter ab Episcopo suo correptus, aut excommunicatus, rumore vel superbiâ inflatus, putaverit separatim Deo sacrificia offerenda, vel aliud erigendum altare contra Ecclesiasticam fidem disciplinamq; crediderit, non exeat impunitus.* And the

Can. 10. same is repeated in the *Greeke Code* of the *African Canons*. *If any Presbyter being excommunicated, or otherwise punished by his* Bishop, *shall not desist, but contest with his* Bishop, *let him by no means goe unpu-*

Act. 4. can. 83. *nished.* * The like is in the *Councell of Chalcedon*, the words are the same that I before cited out of the Canons of the Councell of *Antioch*, and of the *Apostles*. But *Carosus* the Archimandrite spake home in that action. Κάρωσος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἀρχιμανδρίτης εἶπε· πλὴν τῆς τεσσαρακοστῆς ἁγίας καὶ Νικαίας γενομένων πατέρων πίστιν ἐν ᾗ καὶ ἐβαπτίσθην, οἶδα. μετ' ἐμὲ ἄλλην πίστιν οὐκ οἶδα. Ἐπίσκοποί εἰσι, καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἔχουσι, καὶ ἀφορίσαι, καὶ καθαιρῆσαι, καὶ εἴ τι θέλουσιν, ἐξουσίαν ἔχουσι. πλέον ταύτης ἐγὼ ἄλλην οὐκ οἶδα.

Post epist. Archimandritarum ad Concilium pro Dioscori rehabilitatione.

The faith of the 318 Fathers of the Councell of Nice into which I was baptized I know, Other faith I know not. They are Bishops; *They have power to excommunicate and condemne, and they have power to doe what they please: other faith then this I know none.*

* This is to purpose, and it was in one of the foure great Councells of Christendome which all ages since

since have received, with all veneration and devout estimate.

Another of them was that of *Ephesus* conven'd against *Nestorius*, and this ratifies those acts of condemnation which the Bishops had passed upon delinquent Clerks. ὅσοι ἢ ἐπὶ ἀτόποις πράξεσι κατεκρίθησαν ὑπὸ τῆ ἁγίας συνόδε, ἢ ὑπὸ τῶν ἰδίων ἐπισκόπων &c. *They who are for their unworthy practices condemned by the Synod or by their* OWN BISHOPS; although *Nestorius* did endeavour to restore them, yet their condemnation should still remaine vigorous and confirm'd. Concil. Ephes. c. 5.

Vpon which Canon *Balsamon* makes this observation, which indeed of it selfe is cleare enough in the Canon. ἔμαθες ὅτι μητροπολίτης καὶ ἐπίσκοποι δύνανται κρίνειν τοὺς κληρικοὺς αὐτῶν, καὶ ἀφορίσμῳ ἢ καὶ καθυφέσει βάλλειν ὅτε καθυποβάλλειν. *Hence you have learn'd that Metropolitans and Bishops can judge their Clergy, and suspend them, and sometimes depose them.* Nay, they are bound to it, *Pastoralis tamen necessitas habet (ne per plures serpant dira contagia) separare ab ovibus sanis morbidam. It is necessary that the* BISHOP *should separate the scabbed sheep from the sound, least their infection scatter,* so S. *Austin.* * And therefore the fourth Councell of * *Carthage* commands, *ut Episcopus accusatores Fratrum excommunicet, That the Bishop excommunicate the accuser of their Brethren* (*viz.* such as bring Clergy-causes and Catholick doctrine, to be punished in secular tribunalls;) For Excommunication is called by the Fathers *Mucro Episcopalis*, the *Bishops sword* to cut offenders off from the Catholike communion. Cap. 15. de corrept. & gratia. * Can. 55.

I adde no more but that excellent saying of S. *Austin*, which doth freely attest both the preceptive, and vindictive power of the *Bishop* over his whole Dioceſſe. *Ergo præcipiant tantummodò nobis quid facere debeamus qui nobis præsunt, & faciamus orent pro nobis, non autem nos corripiant, & arguant, si non fecerimus. Imò omnia fiant, quoniam Doctores Ecclesiarum Apostoli omnia faciebant, & præcipiebant quæ fierent, & corripiebant si non fierent &c.* And againe; *Corripiantur itaq; à præpositis suis subditi correptionibus de charitate venientibus pro culparum diversitate diversis, vel minoribus, vel amplioribus, quia & ipsa quæ damnatio nominatur quam facit Episcopale judicium, quâ pœnâ in Ecclesiâ nulla major est, potest, si Deus voluerit, in correptionem salutberrimam cedere, atq; proficere.* Here the Biſhops have a power acknowledged in them to command their Dioceſſe, and to puniſh the diſobedient, and of excommunication by way of proper Miniſtery, [*damnatio quam facit Episcopale judicium*] a condemnation of the Biſhops infliction.

ubi supra. cap. 3.

Cap. 15 ibid.

Thus it is evident by the conſtant practice of Primitive Chriſtendome, by the Canons of three *Generall Counſells*, and divers other Provinciall, which are made Catholick by adoption, and inſerting them into the Code of the Catholick Church, that the *Biſhop* was *Iudge* of his Clergy, and of the Lay-people of his Dioceſſe; that he had power to inflict cenſures upon them in caſe of delinquency; that his cenſures were firme and valid; and as yet we find no Presbyters joyning either in com-

commission, or fact, in power, or exercise: but excommunication and censures to be appropriated to Bishops and to be only dispatch't by them, either in full Councell, if it was a Bishops cause, or in his own Consistory, if it was the cause of a Priest, or the inferior Clergy, or a Laick, unlesse in cases of appeale, and then it was *in pleno Concilio Episcoporum*, *in a Synod of* Bishops; And all this was confirmed by secular authority, as appears in the Imperiall Constitutions. *Novel. constit.* 123. c. 11.

For the making up this Paragraph complete, I must insert two considerations. First concerning universality of *causes* within the *Bishops* cognisance. And secondly of *Persons*.

The Ancient *Canons* asserting the Bishops power *in Cognitione causarum* speake in most large, and comprehensive termes. καὶ εἰ τι θέλωσιν, ἐξουσίαν ἔχουσι. *They have power to doe what they list*. Their power is as large as their will. So the Councell of *Chalcedon* before cited. It was no larger though, then S. *Pauls* expression, [*for to this end also did I write, that I might know the proofe of you, whether ye be obedient* IN ALL THINGS.] A large extent of power when the *Apostles* expected an Universall obedience. ἐν πᾶσι. And so the stile of the Church runne in descention, ἄνευ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου μηδὲν πράττειν ὑμᾶς, so *Ignatius*, *ye must doe* NOTHING *without your* BISHOP, καὶ κατὰ μηδὲν αὐτοῦ ἀντιλέγειν, *to contradict him in* NOTHING. The expression is frequent in him, καὶ μὴ κρίνως ἕκαστα διαλαμβάνειν, to comprehend all things in 2. Corinth. 2. 9. *Vbi supra.*

his judgement, or cognisance, so the Councell of
Ca. 9. *Antioch.*

* But these Universall expressions must be understood *secundùm Materiam subjectam*, so S. *Ignatius* expresses himselfe. Ye must without your *Bishop* doe nothing; nothing περὶ ἀνηκόντων εἰς τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν, *of things pertaining to the Church.* So also the Councell of *Antioch*, τὰ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας, *The things of the Church*, are τῷ Ἐπισκόπῳ τῷ πεπιστευμένῳ πᾶσι τὸν λαὸν *committed to the Bishop to whom all the people is intrusted.* They are Ecclesiasticall persons, it is an Ecclesiasticall power they are indowed with, it is for a spirituall end, *viz.* the regiment of the Church, and the good of soules, and therefore only those things which are in this order are of Episcopall cognisance. And what things are those?

1. Then, it is certaine that since Christ hath professed, his Kingdome is not of this world, that government which he hath constituted *de novo* does no way in the world make any intrenchment upon the Royalty.

Hostis Herodes impie
Christum venire quid times?
Non eripit mortalia
Qui regna dat Cœlestia. So the Church us'd to sing. Whatsoever therefore the secular tribunall did take cognisance of before it was Christian, the same it takes notice of after it is Christ'ned. And these are; all actions civill, all publike violations of justice, all breach of Municipall lawes. These the Church hath nothing to doe with, unlesse by the favour

favour of Princes and common-wealths it be indulged to them *in honorem Dei & S. Matris Ecclesiæ*; but then when it is once indulged, that act which does annull such pious vowes, is just contrary to that religion which first gave them, and then unlesse there was sinne in the donative, the ablation of it is *contra honorem Dei & S. Matris Ecclesiæ*. But this it may be is impertinent.

2. The *Bishops* ALL, comes in after this; And he is judge of all those causes which Christianity hath brought in upon a new stock, by it's *new distinctive Principles*. I say, by it's *new Principles*; for there where it extends justice, and pursues the lawes of nature, there the secular tribunall is also extended if it be Christian; The *Bishop* gets nothing of that: But those things which Christianity (as it prescinds from the interest of the republike) hath introduc'd all them, and all the causes emergent from them the *Bishop* is judge of. Such are causes of *faith*, *Ministration of Sacraments*, and *Sacramentals*, *subordination of inferiour Clergy to their Superiour*, *censures*, *irregularities*, *Orders hierarchicall*, *rites and ceremonies*, *liturgyes*, *and publike formes of prayer*, (as is famous in the Ancient story of *Ignatius* teaching his Church the first use of *Antiphona's* and *Doxologyes*, and thence was deriv'd to all Churches of Christendome) and all such things as are in immediate dependance of these, as *dispensation* of Church *Vessels*, and *Ornaments*, and *Goods*, receiving and disposing the Patrimony of the Church, and whatsoever is of the same consideration, according to the

tripart. hist. lib. 10. cap. 9.

41 *Canon* of the *Apostles*. *Præcipimus ut in potestate suâ Episcopus Ecclesiæ res habeat*. *Let the Bishop have the disposing the goods of the* Church; adding this reason. *Si enim animæ hominum pretiosæ illi sint creditæ, multò magis eum oportet curam pecuniarum gerere. He that is intrusted with our pretious soules, may much more be intrusted with the offertorys of faithfull people.*

3. There are some things of a mixt nature; and something of the secular interest, and something of the Ecclesiasticall concurre to their constitution, and these are of double cognisance: the secular power, and the Ecclesiasticall doe both in their severall capacities take knowledge of them. Such are the delinquencyes of Clergy-men, who are both Clergy, and subjects too; *Clerus Domini*, and *Regis subditi*; and for their delinquencyes which are *in materiâ justitiæ* the secular tribunall punishes as being a violation of that right which the State must defend, but because done by a person who is a member of the sacred hierarchy, and hath also an obligation of speciall duty to his *Bishop*, therefore the *Bishop* also may punish him; And when the commonwealth hath inflicted a penalty, the *Bishop* also may impose a censure, for every sinne of a Clergy-man is two. But of this nature also are the convening of Synods, the power whereof is in the *King*, and in the *Bishop* severally, insomuch as both the Church and the commonwealth in their severall respects have peculiar interest; The commonwealth for preservation of peace and charity, in which religion hath the deepest

deepest interest; and the Church, for the maintenance of faith. And therefore both Prince and Bishop have indicted Synods in severall ages, upon the exigence of severall occasions, and have severall powers for the engagement of Clericall obedience, and attendance upon such solemnities.

4. Because Christianity is after the commonwealth, and is a capacity superadded to it, therefore those things which are of mixt cognisance are chiefly in the *King*; The *Supremacy* here is his, and so it is in all things of this nature, which are called [*Ecclesiasticall*] because they are *in materiâ Ecclesiæ, ad finem religionis*, but they are of a different nature, and use from things [*Spirituall*] because they are not issues of those things which Christianity hath introduc'd *de integro*, and are separate from the interest of the commonwealth in it's particular capacity, for such things only, are properly spirituall.

5. The *Bishops* jurisdiction hath a compulsory deriv'd from Christ only, *viz.* infliction of censures by excommunications, or other *minores plagæ* which are in order to it. But yet this internall compulsory through the duty of good Princes to God, and their favour to the Church, is assisted by the secular arme, either superadding a temporall penalty in case of contumacy, or some other way abetting the censures of the Church, and it ever was so since commonwealths were Christian. So that ever since then, Episcopall Iurisdiction hath a double part; an externall, and an internall; this is deriv'd from Christ, that from the King, which because it is concurrent

current in all acts of Iurisdiction, therefore it is, that the King is supreme of the Iurisdiction, *viz.* that part of it which is the externall compulsory.

* * * *

* And for this cause we shall sometimes see the Emperour, or his Prefect, or any man of consular dignity sit Iudge when the Question is of Faith, not that the Prefect was to Iudge of that, or that the *Bishops* were not; But in case of the pervicacy of a peevish heretick who would not submitt to the power of the Church, but flew to the secular power for assistance, hoping by taking sanctuary there, to ingage the favour of the Prince: In this case the *Bishops* also appealed thither, not for resolution, but assistance, and sustentation of the Church's power. * It was so in the case of *Aëtius* the *Arian*, & *Homratus* the Prefect, *Constantius* being Emperour. For, all that the Prefect did, or the Emperour in this case, was by the prevalency of his intervening authority to reconcile the disagreeing parties, and to incourage the Catholikes; but the precise act of Iudicature even in this case was in the *Bishops*, for they deposed *Aëtius* for his heresie, for all his confident appeale, and *Macedonius*, *Eleusius*, *Basilius*, *Ortasius*, and *Dracontius* for personall delinquencyes. * And all this is but to reconcile this act to the resolution, and assertion of S. *Ambrose*, who refus'd to be tryed in a cause of faith by *Lay-Iudges*, though *Delegates of the Emperour*. *Quando audisti (Clementissime Imperator) in causâ fidei Laicos de Episcopo judicâsse? When was it ever knowne that Lay-men in a cause of Faith*

Tripart. hist. lib. 5. c. 35.

S. *Ambros. Epist. lib. 2. Epist.* 13.

Faith did judge a Bishop? To be sure, it was not in the case of *Honoratus* the Prefect; for if they had appealed to him, or to his Master *Constantius* for judgment of the Article, and not for incouragement and secular assistance, S. *Ambrose* his confident Question of [*Quando audisti?*] had quickly been answered, even with saying; presently after the *Councell* of *Ariminum* in the case of *Aëtius*, and *Honoratus*. * Nay it was one of the causes why S. *Ambrose* deposed *Palladius* in the *Councell* of *Aquileia*, because he refused to answer, except it were before some honourable personages of the Laity. And it is observeable that the *Arians* were the first (and indeed they offer'd at it often) that did desire Princes to judge matters of faith, for they despayring of their cause in a Conciliary triall, hoped to ingage the Emperour on their party, by making him Umpire. But the Catholike *Bishops* made humble, and faire remonstrance of the distinction of powers, and Iurisdictions; and as they might not intrench upon the Royalty, so neither betray that right which Christ concredited to them to the incroachment of an exteriour jurisdiction and power. It is a good story that *Suidas* tells of *Leontius* *Bishop of Tripolis in Lydia*, a man so famous and exemplary, that he was call'd ὁ κανὼν τῆς Ἐκκλησίας, *the rule of the Church* that when *Constantius* the Emperour did preside amongst the *Bishops*, and undertooke to determine causes of meere spirituall cognisance, insteed of a *Placet*, he gave this answer, θαυμάζω ἐπὶ ὅπως ἕτερα δόγματα τιθεῖς, ἑτέρας ἐπιχειρεῖς· στρατιωτικῶν μὲ, καὶ πολιτικῶν πραγμάτων

In verbo Λεόντιος.

θρεσκικῶς· ἐπισκόποις δὲ περὶ τῆς εἰς μόνους ἐπισκόπους ἡκόντων διατυπώμεθα. ἢ σὺ βασιλέα καταδεδέχθαι πείσασθαι ἢ ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις ἤδη παιδαγώγους. *I wonder that thou being set over things of a different nature, medlest with those things that only appertaine to Bishops. The* MILITIA, *and the* POLITIA *are thine, but matters of* FAITH, *and* SPIRIT, *are of* EPISCOPALL *cognisance.* τοιοῦτος ὢν ὁ Λεόντιος ἐλεύθερος. *Such was the freedome of the ingenuous Leontius.* Answerable to which, was that Christian and faire acknowledgement of *Valentinian* when the *Arian* Bishops of Bithynia & the Hellespont sent *Hypatianus* their legate to desire him, *ut dignaretur ad emendationem dogmati interesse, that he would be pleas'd to mend the Article. Respondens Valentinianus, ait, Mihi quidem quum unus de populo sim fas non est talia perscrutari. Verùm Sacerdotes apud se ipsos congregentur ubi voluerint. Cum ἡ hæc respondisset Princeps in Lampsacum convenerunt Episcopi.* So *Sozomen* reports the story. The Emperour would not meddle with matters of faith, but referred the deliberation, and decision of them to the *Bishops* to whom by God's law they did appertaine; Upon which intimation given, the *Bishops* conven'd in *Lampsacum*. And thus a double power met in the *Bishops*. A divine right to decide the article. *Mihi fas non est,* (saith the Emperour) *it is not lawfull for me to meddle*; And then a right from the Emperour to assemble, for he gave them leave to call a Councell. These are two distinct powers, One from Christ, the other from the Prince. * * *

hist. tripart. lib. 7. c. 12.

And now upon this occasion, I have faire opportunity

tunity to insert a consideration, The *Bishops* have power over all causes emergent in their dioceses; all, (I meane) in the sense above explicated; they have power to inflict censures, excommunication is the highest, the rest are parts of it, and in order to it. Whether or no must Church-censures be used in all such causes as they take cognisance of, or may not the secular power find out some externall compulsory in stead of it, and forbid the Church to use excommunication, in certaine cases?

1. To this, I answer, that if they be such cases in which by the law of Christ they may, or such in which they must use excommunication, then, in these cases no power can forbid them. For what power Christ hath given them, no man can take away.

2. As no humane power can disrobe the Church of the power of excommunication; so no humane power can invest the Church with a lay Compulsory. For if the Church be not capable of a *jus gladij*, as most certainly shee is not, the Church cannot receive power to put men to death, or to inflict lesser paines in order to it, or any thing above a salutary penance; I meane in the formality of a Church-tribunall, then they give the Church what shee must not, cannot take. I deny not but Clergy men are as capable of the power of life and death, as any men; but not in the formality of Clergymen. A Court of life and death, cannot be an Ecclesiasticall tribunall; and then if any man, or company of Men should perswade the Church not to

inflict her censures upon delinquents, in some cases in which shee might lawfully inflict them, and pretend to give her another compulsory; they take away the Church-consistory, and erect a very secular Court, dependant on themselves, and by consequence to be appeal'd to from themselves, and so also to be prohibited as the Lay-superiour shall see cause for. * Whoever therefore should be consenting to any such permutation of power, is *traditor potestatis quam S. Mater Ecclesia à sponso suo acceperat, he betrayes the individuall, and inseparable right of holy Church.* For her censures shee may inflict upon her delinquent children without asking leave. Christ is her ἐνδυνία for that, he is her warrant and security. The other is beg'd, or borrow'd, none of her owne, nor of a fit edge to be us'd in her abscissions, and coërcions. * I end this consideration with that memorable *Canon* of the *Apostles* of so frequent use in this Question, πάντων δὲ Ἐκκλησιαστικῶν πραγμάτων ὁ Ἐπίσκοπος ἐχέτω τὴν φροντίδα. *Let the Bishop have the care or provision for all affaires of the Church*, and let him dispense them *velut Deo contemplante* as in the sight of God, to whom he must be responsive for all his Dioceſs.

Can. 39.

The next Consideration concerning the *Bishop's* jurisdiction is of what persons he is Iudge? And because our Scene lyes here in Church-practice I shall only set downe the doctrine of the Primitive Church in this affaire, and leave it under that representation.

Presbyters, and *Deacons*, and inferiour Clerks, and the

the Laity are already involved in the precedent *Canons*; No man there, was exempted of whose soule any *Bishop* had charge. And all Christs sheepe heare his voice, and the call of his sheap-heard-Ministers. * *Theodoret* tells a story that when the *Bishops* of the Province were assembled by the command of *Valentinian* the Emperour for the choice of a Successor to *Auxentius* in the See of *Millayne*, the Emperour wished them to be carefull in the choice of a *Bishop*, in these words, ποιῆσον ἡ οὗ κὴ ἡμῶν τοῖς ἀρχιερατικοῖς ἐγκαθιδρύσατε θρόνοις, ὅπως κὴ ἡμεῖς οἱ τῶν Galeíαν ἰθύνοντες εἰλικρινῶς αὐτῷ τὰς ἡμετέρας ὑποκλίνωμεν κεφαλάς. *Set such an one in the Archiepiscopall throne, that we who rule the Kingdome may sincerely submitt our head unto him, viz:* in matters of spirituall import. * And since all power is deriv'd from Christ, who is a King, and a Priest, and a Prophet, Christian Kings are *Christi Domini*, and Vicars in his Regall power, but *Bishops* in his *Sacerdotall*, and *Prophetical*. * So that the King hath a Supreme Regall power in causes of the Church, ever since his Kingdome became Christian, and it consists in all things, in which the Priestly office is not precisely by Gods law imployed for regiment, and cure of soules, and in these also, all the externall compulsory and jurisdiction in his owne. For when his Subjects became Christian Subjects, himselfe also upon the same termes becomes a Christian Ruler, and in both capacities he is to rule, viz: both as Subjects, and as Christian Subjects, except only in the precise issues of Sacerdotall authority. And therefore

Theodoret. lib. 4. c. 5.

the King dome, and the Priesthood are excelled by each other in their severall capacities. For superiority is usually expressed in three words, ὑπεροχὴ, ἀρχὴ, and ἐξουσία, *Excellency*, *Impery*, *and Power*. The King is supreme to the Bishop in *Impery*; The Bishop hath an *Excellency*, *viz.* of Spirituall Ministration which Christ hath not concredited to the King; but in *Power*, both *King*, and *Bishop* have it distinctly in severall capacity; the King *in potentiâ gladii*, the Bishop *in potestate clavium*. The Sword, and the Keyes are the emblems of their distinct power. Something like this is in the third Epistle of S. *Clement* translated by *Ruffinus*. *Quid enim in præsenti sæculo prophetâ gloriosius, Pontifice clarius, Rege sublimius?* King, and Priest, and Prophet, are in their severall excellencies, the Highest powers under heaven. *** In this sense it is easy to understand those expressions often used in Antiquity, which might seem to make intrenchment upon the sacredness of Royall prerogatives; were not both the piety, and sense of the Church sufficiently cleare in the issues of her humblest obedience. * And this is the sense of S. *Ignatius* that holy *Martyr*, and disciple of the *Apostles*: *Diaconi, & reliquus Clerus, unà cum populo Universo, Militibus, Principibus, & Cæsare, ipsi Episcopo pareant. Let the Deacons and all the Clergy, and all the people, the Souldiers, the Princes, and Cæsar himselfe obey the Bishop.* * This is it, which S. *Ambrose* said; *Sublimitas Episcopalis nullis poterit comparationibus adæquari. Si Regum fulgori compares, & Principum diademati, erit*

Epist. ad Philadelph.

Lib. de dignit. Sacerd. cap. 2.

rit inferius &c. This also was acknowledged by the great *Constantine*, that most blessed Prince, *Deus vos constituit Sacerdotes, & potestatem vobis dedit, de nobis quoq; judicandi, & ideo nos à vobis rectè judicamur. Vos autem non potestis ab hominibus judicari,* [*viz. sæcularibus*, and *in causis simplicis religionis.*] So that good Emperour in his oration to the *Nicene* Fathers. *Lib.* 10. *Eccles. hist. c.* 2.

It was a famous contestation that S. *Ambrose* had with *Auxentius* the *Arian* pretending the Emperors command to him to deliver up some certain Churches in his Diocesse to the *Arians*. His answer was, that *Palaces* belong'd to the *Emperour*, but *Churches* to the *Bishop*; and so they did, by all the lawes of Christendome. The like was in the case of S. *Athanasius*, and *Constantius* the Emperour, exactly the same *per omnia*, as it is related by *Ruffinus*. * S. *Ambrose* his sending his Deacon to the Empe- *Lib.* 10. *Eccles. hist. cap.* 19. rour, to desire him to goe forth of the *Cancelli*, in his Church at *Millain*, shewes that then the powers were so distinct, that they made no intrenchment upon each other. * It was no greater power, but a more considerable act, and higher exercise, the forbidding the communion to *Theodosius*, till he had by repentance, washed out the bloud that stuck upon him ever since the Massacre at *Thessalonica*. It was a wonderfull concurrence of piety in the Emperour, and resolution and authority in the *Bishop*. But he was not the first that did it; For *Philip* the Emperour was also guided by the Pastorall rod, and the severity of the *Bishop*. *De hoc traditum est nobis, quod* *Theodor. lib.* 5. *c.* 18. *Euseb lib.* 6. *cap.* 25.

quod Christianus fuerit, & in die Paschæ, i.e. in ipsis vigiliis cùm interesse voluerit, & communicare mysteriis, ab Episcopo loci non priùs esse permissum, nisi confiteretur peccata, & inter pœnitentes staret, nec ullo modo sibi copiam mysteriorum futuram nisi priùs per pœnitentiam, culpas quæ de eo ferebantur plurimæ, deluisset. The Bishop of the place would not let him communicate till hee had wash't away his sinnes by repentance. And the Emperour did so. *Ferunt igitur libenter eum quod à Sacerdote imperatum fuerat, suscepisse. He did it willingly, undertaking the impositions laid upon him by the Bishop.*

I doubt not but all the world believes the dispensation of the Sacraments intirely to belong to Ecclesiasticall Ministery. It was S. *Chrysostomes* command to his Presbyters, to reject all wicked persons from the holy Communion. *Homil. 83. in 26. Matth.* "*If he be a Captaine, a Consull, or a Crowned King that cometh unworthily, forbid him and keep him off, thy power is greater then his. If thou darest not remove him, tell it mee, I will not suffer it, &c.* And had there never been more errour in the managing Church-censures, then in the foregoing instances, the Church might have exercised censures, and all the parts of power that Christ gave her; without either scandall or danger to her selfe, or her penitents. But when in the very censure of excommunication there is a new ingredient put, a great proportion of secular inconveniences, and humane interest, when excommunications, as in the Apostles times they were deliverings over to Satan, so now, shall be de-

liverings

liverings over to a forraine enemy, or the peoples rage; as then, to be buffeted, so now to be deposed, or disinteresst in the allegeance of subjects; in these cases, excommunication being nothing like that which Christ authorized, and no way cooperating toward the end of its institution, but to an end of private designes, and rebellious interest, *Bishops* have no power of such censures, nor is it lawfull to inflict thē, things remaining in that consistence, and capacity. And thus is that famous saying to be understood reported by S. *Thomas* to be S. *Austin's*, but is indeed found in the *Ordinary Glosse* upon *Matth.*13. *Princeps & multitudo non est excommunicanda. A Prince or a Common wealth are not to be excommunicate.*

In 3. partis Supplem. q. 22 a. 5. Vide Aug. ep. 75. *&* Gratian. *dist.* 24. *q.* 2. *c. Si habet. sed ibi* [Princeps] *non inscribitur, sed tantùm in glossâ ordinariâ.*

Thus I have given a short account of the Persons, and causes of which *Bishops* according to Catholick practice did, and might take cognisance. This use only I make of it. Although Christ hath given great authority to his Church in order to the regiment of soules, such a power, *quæ nullis poterit comparationibus adæquari*, yet it hath its limits, and a proper cognisance, *viz. things spirituall*, and the emergencies, and consequents from those things which Christianity hath introduced *de novo*, and superadded, as things totally disparate from the precise interest of the Common-wealth; And this the rather noted, to show how those men would mend themselves that cry downe the tyranny (as they list to call it) of *Episcopacy*, and yet call for the *Presbytery*. *** For the *Presbytery does challenge*

Vide the book of Order of Excomm. in Scotland. & the Hist. of Scotland. *Admonit.* 2. *p.* 46. *Knox* his exhortation to England.

cognisance of all causes whatsoever, which are either sinnes directly, or by reduction. *[*All crimes which by the Law of God deserve death.*] There they bring in Murders, Treasons, Witchcrafts, Felonies. Then the *Minor* faults they bring in under the title of [*Scandalous and offensive*] Nay [*Quodvis peccatum,*] saith *Snecanus*, to which if we adde this consideration, that they believe *every action of any man to have in it the malignity of a damnable sinne*, there is nothing in the world, good or bad, vitious or suspitious; scandalous, or criminall; true, or imaginary; reall actions, or personall, in all which, and in all contestations, and complaints one party is delinquent, either by false accusation, or reall injury; but they comprehend in their vast gripe, and then they have power to nullify all Courts, and judicatories, besides their owne: and being, for this their cognisance they pretend *Divine institution*, there shall be no causes IMPERFECT in their Consistory, *no appeale from them*, but they shall heare, and determine with finall resolution, and it will be sinne, and therefore punishable, to complaine of injustice and illegality. * If this be confronted but with the pretences of *Episcopacy*, and the Modesty of their severall demands, and the reasonablenesse, and divinity of each vindication examined, I suppose, were there nothing but Prudentiall motives to be put into ballance to weigh downe this Question, the cause would soone be determin'd, and the little finger of Presbytery, not only in it's exemplary, and tryed practises, but in its dogmaticall pretensions

is heavier then the loynes, nay then the whole body of *Episcopacy*; but it seldome happens otherwise, but that they who usurpe a power, prove tyrants in the execution, whereas the issues of a lawfull power are faire and moderate.

§ 37. Forbidding Presbyters to officiate without Episcopall license,

BUT I must proceed to the more *particular* instances of *Episcopall* Iurisdiction. The whole power of Ministration both of the Word and Sacraments was in the *Bishop* by *prime* authority, and in the *Presbyters* by *commission* and *delegation*, insomuch that they might not exercise any ordinary ministration without license from the *Bishop*. They had power and capacity by their order to Preach, to Minister, to Offer, to Reconcile, and to Baptize. They were indeed acts of order, but that they might not by the law of the Church exercise any of these acts, without license from the *Bishop*, that is an act or issue of jurisdiction, and shewes the superiority of the *Bishop* over his *Presbyters*, by the practice of Christendome.

S. *Ignatius* hath done very good offices in all the parts of this Question, and here also he brings in succour. οὐχ ἐξὸν ἐστὶ χωρὶς τοῦ Ἐπισκόπου οὔτε βαπτίζειν, οὔτε θυσίαν προσφέρειν, οὔτε θυσίαν προσκομίζειν, οὔτε δοχὴν ἐπιτελεῖν. *It is not lawfull without the Bishop* (*viz.* without his leave) *either to baptize, or to offer Sacrifice, or to make oblation, or to keep feasts of charity:* and a little before; speaking of the B. Eucharist, and its ministration, and having premised a generall interdict for doing any thing without the *Bishops* consent, *Epist. ad Smyrn.*

ἐκείνη ἡ βεβαία δόξειεν ἡγεῖσθαι ἡ ὑπὸ τὸν Ἐπίσκοπον οὖσα ἢ ᾧ ἂν αὐτὸς ἐπιτρέψῃ. *But let that Eucharist* (saith he) *be held valid which is celebrated under the Bishop, or under him, to whom the Bishop shall permit.* * * *

* I doe not here dispute the matter of *right*, and whether or no the Presbyters might *de jure* doe any offices without Episcopall licence, but whether or no *de facto* it was permitted them in the primitive Church? This is sufficient to show, to what issue the reduction of *Episcopacy* to a primitive consistence will drive; and if I mistake not, it is at least a very probable determination of the question of *right* too. For who will imagine that *Bishops* should at the first in the calenture of their infant devotion, in the new spring of Christianity, in the times of persecution, in all the publike disadvantages of state and fortune, when they anchor'd only upon the shore of a Holy Conscience, that then they should have thoughts ambitious, incroaching, of usurpation and advantages, of purpose to devest their Brethren of an authority intrusted them by Christ, and then too when all the advantage of their honour did only set them upon a hill to feele a stronger blast of persecution, and was not, as since it hath been, attested with secular assistance, and faire arguments of honour, but was only in a meere spirituall estimate, and ten thousand reall disadvantages. This will not be suppos'd either of wise or holy men. But however. *Valeat quantum valere potest.* The question is now of matter of *fact*, and if the Church of Martyrs, and the Church of Saints, and Doctors, and

and Confessors now regnant in heaven, be faire precedents for practices of Christianity, we build upon a rock, though we had digg'd no deeper then this foundation of Catholick practise.

Upon the hopes of these advantages, I proceed. Εἴ τις πρεσβύτερος καταφρονήσας τὸν ἴδιον Ἐπισκόπον χωρὶς συναγωγὴν ἢ συστάσιον ποιεῖ, καθαιρείσθω. *If any Presbyter disrespecting his own Bishop shall make conventions apart, or erect an altar* (*viz.* without the Bishops license) *let him be deposed*; clearely intimating that *potestas faciendi concionem, the power of making of Church-meetings and assemblies,* for preaching or other offices is derived from the Bishop; and therefore the Canon adds καθαιρείσθω ὡς φιλάρχος· τύραννος γάρ ἐστι. *He is a lover of Rule, he is a Tyrant*, that is, an usurper of that power & government which belongs to the *Bishop*. The same thing is also decreed in the Councell of *Antioch*, and in the *Councell* of *Chalcedon*, πάντες οἱ διλαβέσατοι ἐπίσκοποι ἐβόησαν, τὸς δίκαιος κάνονας, τὸς τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων. *All the most Reverend Bishops cryed out, this is a righteous law, this is the Canon of the holy Fathers.* [This] *viz.* The Canon Apostolicall now cited. * *Tertullian* is something more particular, and instances in Baptisme. *Dandi baptismum jus habet summus Sacerdos, qui est Episcopus. Dehinc Presbyteri & Diaconi, non tamen sine Episcopi authoritate, propter honorem Ecclesiæ, quo salvo salva pax est; alioquin etiam Laicis jus est.* The place is of great consideration, and carries in it its own objection and its answer. "*The* Bishop "*hath the right of giving baptisme. Then after him,*

Can. Apost. 32

Ca. 5. *Act.* 4.

De baptism.

" *Presbyters and Deacons, but not without the autho-*
" *rity of the* Bishop. (So farre the testimony is
" clear) and this is *for the honour of the Church.* *
But does not this intimate it was only by *positive* constitution, and neither by *Divine* nor *Apostolicall* ordinance? No indeed. It does not. For it might be so ordained by Christ or his Apostles *propter honorem Ecclesiæ*; and no harme done. For it is honourable for the Church, that her Ministrations should be most ordinate, and so they are when they descend from the superior to the subordinate. But the next words doe of themselves make answer, [*Otherwise lay-men have right to baptize*] That is, *without the consent of the* Bishop *Lay-men can doe it as much as Presbyters and Deacons.* For indeed baptisme conferred by Lay-men is valid and not to be repeated, but yet they ought not to administer it, so neither ought *Presbyters* without the *Bishops* license: so saies *Tertullian*, let him answer it. Only the difference is this, Lay-men cannot *jure ordinario* receive a leave or commission to make it lawfull in them to baptize any; Presbyters and Deacons may, for their order is a capacity or possibility. ** But besides the Sacrament of Baptisme, *Tertullian* affirmes the same of the venerable Eucharist. *Eucharistiæ Sacramentum non de aliorum manu quàm Præsidentium sumimus.* The former place will expound this, if there be any scruple in [*Præsidentium*] for clearly the Christians receive the Sacrament of the *Eucharist* from none but *Bishops*. I suppose he means [*without Episcopall license.*] whatsoever his

De coronâ milit c.3. vide S. Chrysost. hom. 11. in 1. Tim. & S. Hieron. dial. adv. Lucifer.

his meaning is, these are his words.

The Councell of *Gangra*, forbidding *conventicles*, expresses it with this intimation of Episcopall "authority. *If any man shall make assemblies privately, & out of the Church, so despising the Church, "or shall doe any Church-offices* μὴ συνίοντος τῷ πρεσβυτέρῳ καὶ χωρίῳ ἐπισκόπου, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω, *without the presence of a Priest by* THE DECREE OF A BISHOP, *let him be anathema.* The *Priest* is not to be assistant at any meeting for private offices without the *Bishops* license. If they will celebrate *Synaxes* privately, it must be by a *Priest*, and he must be there by leave of the *Bishop*, & then the assembly is lawfull. * And this thing was so knowne, that the Fathers of the second Councell of *Carthage* call it ignorance or hypocrisy in *Priests* to doe their offices without a license from the *Bishop*. *Numidius Episcopus Massilytanus dixit, In quibusdam locis sunt Presbyteri qui aut ignorantes simpliciter, aut dissimulantes audacter, præsente, & inconsulto Episcopo complurimis in domicilijs agunt agenda, quod disciplinæ incongruum cognoscit esse Sanctitas vestra. In some places there are Priests that in private houses doe offices* (housling of people is the office meant, communicating them at home) *without the consent or leave of the Bishop, being either simply ignorant, or boldly dissembling*; Implying, that they could not else but know their duties to be, to procure Episcopall license for their ministrations. *Ab Universis Episcopis dictum est. Quisquis Presbyter inconsulto Episcopo agenda in quolibet loco voluerit celebrare, ipse honori suo contrarius*

Can. 6.

Ca. 9.

"*trarius existit. All the Bishops said, if any Priest*
"*without leave of his Bishop shall celebrate the myste-*
"*ries, be the place what it will be, he is an Enemy to*
"*the Bishops dignity.*

After this in *time*, but before in *authority* is the great Councell of *Chalcedon*. οἱ κληρικοὶ ... πάντῃ τῆς ἐν ἑκάστῃ πόλει ἐπισκόπου τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ καὶ τοῖς πρὸ αὐτοῦ ἁγίοις πατράσι παρεδόθη διακυβερνᾶσθαι. *Let the Clergy according to the tradition of the Fathers, remaine under the power of the Bishops of the City.* So that they are for their offices in dependance of the authority of the *Bishop*. The Canon instances particularly to Priests officiating in Monasteries and Hospitalls, but extends it selfe to an indefinite expression μὴ καταδικάζεσθαι, ἢ ἀφίστασθαι τῆς ἰδίας ἐπισκόπου, *They must not dissent or differ from their Bishop*. οἱ δὲ παραβαίνοντες καθαιρέσιν πάντως ὑποκείσονται κατὰ τὸν τοιοῦτον τρόπον &c: *All they that transgresse this Constitution in* ANY WAY, *not submitting to their Bishop, let them be punish'd canonically.* So that now these generall expressions of obedience and subordination to the *Bishop* being to be Understood according to the exigence of the matter, to wit, the Ministeries of the Clergy in their severall offices, the Canon extends it's prohibition to all ministrations without the *Bishops* authority.

Can. 8. part. 2. Act. 14.

But it was more clearely and evidently law and practice in the *Roman* Church, we have good witnesse for it; S. *Leo* the Bishop of that Church is my author. *Sed neq; coram Episcopo licet Presbyteris in baptisterium introire, nec præsente Antistite infantem tingere, aut signare, nec pœnitentem sine præcep-*

Epist. 86.

tione

tione Episcopi sui reconciliare, nec eo præsente nisi illo jubente Sacramentum corporis & Sanguinis Christi conficere, nec eo coràm posito populum docere, vel benedicere &c. It is not lawfull for the Presbyters to enter into the baptistery, nor to baptize any Catechumens, nor to consecrate the Sacrament of Christs body and bloud in the presence of the Bishop without his command. From this place of S. *Leo*, if it be set in conjunction with the precedent, we have faire evidence of this whole particular. It is not lawfull to doe any offices without the *Bishops* leave; So S. *Ignatius*, so the *Canons* of the *Apostles*, so *Tertullian*, so the Councells of *Antioch* and *Chalcedon*. It is not lawfull to doe any offices in the *Bishops* presence without leave, so S. *Leo*. The Councell of *Carthage* joynes them both together, *neither in his presence, nor without his leave in any place.*

Now against this practice of the Church, if any man should discourse as S. *Hierome* is pretended to doe by *Gratian*, *Qui non vult Presbyteros facere quæ jubentur à Deo, dicat quis major est Christo. He that will not let Presbyters doe what they are commanded to doe by God, let him tell us if any man be greater then Christ, viz:* whose command it is, that Presbyters should preach. Why then did the Church require the *Bishop's* leave? might not *Presbyters* doe their duty without a license? This is it which the practice of the Church is abundantly sufficient to answer. * For to the *Bishop* is committed the care of *the whole diocese*, he it is that must give the *highest* account for the whole charge, he it is

dist. 95. cap. Ecce ego.

who is appointed by peculiar designation to feede the flock, so the *Canon* of the [1] *Apostles*, so [2] *Ignatius*, so the Councell of [3] *Antioch*, so every where; The *Presbyters* are admitted *in partem sollicitudinis*, but still the *jurisdiction* of the *whole Diocesse* is in the *Bishop*, and without the *Bishop's* admission to a part of it *per traditionem subditorum*, although the *Presbyter* by his ordination have a *capacity* of preaching and administring Sacraments, yet he cannot *exercise* this without designation of a particular charge either temporary or fixt. And therefore it is, that a *Presbyter* may not doe these acts without the *Bishops* leave, because they are actions of relation, and suppose a congregation to whom they must be administred, or some particular person; for a Priest must not preach to the stones as some say *Venerable Bede* did, nor communicate alone, the word is destructive of the thing, nor baptize unless he have a Chrysome Child, or a Catechumen; So that *all* of the Diocesse being the *Bishop's* charge, the *Bishop* must either authorize the *Priest*, or the *Priest* must not meddle, least he be (what S. *Peter* blam'd) ἀλλοτριεπίσκοπος, *a Bishop in anothers Diocesse*: Not that the *Bishop* did license the acts precisely of baptizing, of consecrating &c. For these he had by his *ordination*, but that in giving license he did give him a subject to whom he might apply these relative actions, and did *quoad hoc* take him *in partem sollicitudinis* and concredit some part of his diocesse to his administration *cum curâ animarum*.

[1] *Can.* 40.
[2] *Epist. ad Ephes.*
[3] *cap.* 24.

But then on the other side because the *whole* cure of

of the Diocesse is in the *Bishop*, he cannot exonerate himselfe of it, for it is a burden of Christs imposing, or it is not imposed at all, therefore this taking of *Presbyters* into part of the *regiment* and *care* does not devest him of his own power, or any part of it, nor yet ease him of his care, but that as he must still ἐπισκοπεῖν, *visit* and *see to his Diocesse*, so he hath authority still in all parts of his Diocesse, and this appears in these places now quoted; insomuch as when the *Bishop* came to any place, there the *Vicaria* of the *Presbyters* did cease. *In præsentiâ Majoris cessat potestas minoris.* And, though because the *Bishop* could not doe all the *Minor* and daily offices of the Priesthood in every congregation of his Diocesse, therefore he appointed *Priests* severally to officiate, himselfe looking to the *Metropolis* and the daughter Churches by a *generall* supravision; yet when the *Bishop* came into any place of his Diocesse, *there* he being present might doe any office, because it was in his own charge, which he might concredit to another, but not exonerate himselfe of it; And therefore *præsente Episcopo* (saith the Councell of *Carthage*, and S. *Leo*) *if the Bishop be present*, the Presbyter without leave might not officiate; For he had no subjects of his owne, but by trust and delegation, and this delegation was given him to supply the *Bishops* absence, who could not *simul omnibus intereſse*, but then, where he was present, the cause of delegation ceasing, the jurisdiction also ceased, or was at least absorpt in the greater, and so without leave might not be exercised; like

the starres which in the noon day have their own naturall light, as much as in the night, but appeare not, shine not in the presence of the Sunne.

This perhaps will seem uncouth to those *Presbyters*, who (as the Councell of *Carthage's* expression is) are *contrarii honori Episcopali*; but yet if we keep our selves in our own forme, where God hath placed us, and where wee were in the Primitive Church, wee shall find all this to be sooth, and full of order. For Consider. The elder the prohibition was, the more absolute & indefinite it runs. [*Without the Bishop it is not lawfull to baptize, to consecrate*] *&c.* So *Ignatius*. The prohibition is without limit. But in descent of the Church it runnes, [*præsente Episcopo*] *the Bishop being present* they must not without leave. The thing is all one, and a derivation from the same originall, to wit, the *Universality of the Bishops Iurisdiction*, but the reason of the difference of expression is this. At first *Presbyters* were in Cities with the *Bishop*, and no parishes at all concredited to them. The *Bishops* lived in Cities, the *Presbyters* preach'd and offer'd κατ' οἶκον *from house to house* according as the *Bishop* directed them. Here they had no *ordinary charge*, and therefore the first prohibitions runne indefinitely, they must not doe any Clericall offices *sine Episcopo, unlesse the Bishop sends them*. But then afterwards when the Parishes were distinct, and the *Presbyters* fix't upon *ordinary charges*, then it was only, *præsente Episcopo, if the Bishop was present*, they might not officiate without leave. For in his absence they might

might doe it, I doe not say *without leave*, but I say they had leave given them, when the *Bishop* sent them to officiate in a Village with ordinary or temporary residence; as it is to this day, when the *Bishop* institutes to a particular charge, he also gives power *hoc ipso*, of officiating in that place. So that at first when they did officiate in places by *temporary missions*, then they were to have leave, but this *license* was also *temporary*; but when they were fixt upon *ordinary charges* they might not officiate without leave, but then they had an *ordinary leave* given them *in traditione subditorum*, and that was done *in subsidium Muneris Episcopalis*, because it was that part of the *Bishops* charge, which he could not personally attend for execution of the *Minor* offices, and therefore concredited it to a *Presbyter*, but if he was present, a *new leave* was necessary, because as the *power* alwaies was in the *Bishop*, so now the *execution* also did returne to him when he was there in person, himselfe if he listed, might officiate.

All this is excellently attested in the example of S. *Austin*, of whom *Possidonius* in his life reports that being but a *Presbyter*, *Valerius* the Bishop being a Greek borne, and not well spoken in the Latin tongue, and so unfit for publike orations, *eidem Presbytero* (*viz.* to *Austin*) *potestatem dedit coram se in Ecclesiâ Evangelium prædicandi, ac frequentissimè tractandi contra* USUM *quidem, &* CONSUETUDINEM *Africanarum Ecclesiarum. He gave leave to Austin then but Presbyter, to preach in the Church,*

even while himselfe was present, indeed against the Vse *and* Custome *of the African Churches.* And for this act of his he suffered soundly in his report. * For the case was thus. In all *Africa* ever since the first spring of the *Arian* heresy, the Church had then suffered so much by the preaching of *Arius* the *Presbyter*, that they made a Law not to suffer any *Presbyter* to preach at all, at least in the *Mother Church*, and in the Bishops presence. τοῦτο ἀρχὴν ἔλαβεν ἐφ' ὧ Ἄρειος τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν ἐτάραξε (saith *Socrates.*) *Thence came this Custome in the African Churches.* But because *Valerius* saw S. *Austin* so able, and himselfe for want of Latin so unfit, he gave leave to *Austin* to preach before him, against the *Custome* of the *African* Churches. But he addes this reason for his excuse too; it was not indeed the custome of *Africa*, but it was of the Orientall Churches. For so *Possidonius* proceeds, *sed & ille vir venerabilis, ac providus, in orientalibus Ecclesiis id ex more fieri sciens*, in the Levant it was usuall for Bishops to give Presbyters leave to preach, *dummodò facultaretur à Presbytero quod à se Episcopo impleri minimè posse cernebat*, which determines us fully in the businesse. For this leave to doe offices was but there to be given where the Bishop himselfe could not fulfill the offices, which showes the *Presbyters* in their severall charges, whether of temporary mission, or fixt residence, to be but Delegates, and Vicars of the Bishop admitted *in partem Sollicitudinis*, to assist the Bishop in his great charge of the whole Diocesse.

Lib. 5. c. 22.

Against

Against this it is objected out of S. *Hierome*, and it is recorded by *Gratian*, *Ecce ego dico præsentibus Episcopis suis, atq; adstantibus in altari Presbyteros posse Sacramenta conficere. Behold, I say that Presbyters may minister Sacraments in presence of the Bishop.* So *Gratian* quotes it indeed, but S. *Hierome* laies the expresse contrary, unlesse we all have false copies. For in S. *Hierome* it is not [*Ecce ego dico*] but [*Nec ego dico.*] He does not say it is lawfull for Presbyters to officiate in the presence of their *Bishop*. Indeed S. *Hierome* is angry at *Rusticus* *Bishop of Narbona* becausse he would not *give leave* to Presbyters to preach, nor to blesse &c. This, perhaps it was not well done, but this makes not against the former discourse; for though it may be fit for the Bishop to give leave, the Church requiring it still more and more in descent of ages, and multiplication of Christians, and Parishes, yet it is cleare that this is not to be done without the Bishops leave, for it is for this very thing that S. *Hierome* disputes against *Rusticus*, to show he did amisse, becausse he would not give his Presbyters license. * And this he also reprehends in his epistle *ad Nepotianum*, *Pessimæ consuetudinis est in quibusdam Ecclesiis tacere Presbyteros, & præsentibus Episcopis non loqui. That Presbyters might not be suffered to preach in presence of the Bishop, that was an ill custome*, to wit, as things then stood, and it was mended presently after, for Presbyters did preach in the Bishops presence, but it was *by license from their Ordinary*. For so *Possidonius* relates, that upon this act of *Valerius*

Ad Rusticum Narbon. dist. 95. can. Ecce ego.

before

before mentioned, *Posteà currente & volante hujusmodi famâ, bono præcedente exemplo,* Accepta Ab Episcopis Potestate *Presbyteri nonnulli coram Episcopis, populis tractare cæperunt verbum Dei.* By occasion of this precedent it came to passe, that some Presbyters did preach to the people in the Bishops presence, having first obtain'd faculty from the Bishop so to doe. And a little after it became a custome from a generall faculty and dispensation indulged to them in the second Councell of *Vase.* Now if this evidence of Church practise be not sufficient to reconcile us to S. *Hierome*, let him then first be reconciled to himselfe, and then we are sure to be help'd. For in his dialogue against the *Luciferians*, his words are these, *Cui si non exors quædam & ab omnibus eminens detur potestas, tot efficientur Schismata quot sunt Sacerdotes. Inde venit ut sine Episcopi missione neq; Presbyter, neq; Diaconus jus habeant baptizandi.* Because the Bishop hath an eminent power, and this power is necessary, thence it comes that neither Presbyter nor Deacon may so much as baptize without the Bishops leave.

Gan. 12.

** This whole discourse showes clearely not only the Bishops to be superiour in jurisdiction, but that they have sole jurisdiction, and the Presbyters only in substitution and vicaridge.

§ 38. Reserving Church goods to Episcopall dispensation,

** Divers other acts there are to attest the superiority of the Bishops jurisdiction over Priests and Deacons, as, that all the goods of the Church were in the Bishops sole disposing, and as at

at first they were laid at the Apostles feet, so afterwards, at the Bishops. So it is in the 41. Canon of the Apostles, so it is in the Councell of *Gangra*, and all the world are excluded from intervening in the dispensation, without expresse delegation from the Bishop, as appears in the seventh and eight Canons, and that under pain of an *anathema* by the holy Councell. * And therefore when in successe of time, some Patrons that had founded Churches and endowed them, thought that the dispensation of those lands did not belong to the Bishop; of this the third Councell of *Toledo* complains, and makes remedy, commanding, *ut omnia* SECUNDUM CONSTITUTIONEM ANTIQUAM, *ad Episcopi ordinationem & potestatem pertineant.* The same is renewed in the fourth Councell of *Toledo*. *Noverint autem conditores basilicarum in rebus quas eisdem Ecclesiis conferunt, nullam se potestatem habere,* SED IUXTA CANONUM INSTITUTA, *sicut Ecclesiam, ita & dotem ejus ad ordinationem Episcopi pertinere.* These Councells I produce not as Iudges, but as witnesses in the businesse, for they give concurrent testimony that as the Church it selfe, so the dowry of it too did belong to the *Bishops* disposition by the Ancient *Canons*. For so the third *Councell of Toledo* calls it, *antiquam Constitutionem*, and it selfe is almost 1100. years old, so that still I am precisely within the bounds of the Primitive Church though it be taken in a narrow sense. For so it was determin'd in the great Councell of *Chalcedon*, commanding that the goods of the Church should be

An. Dom. 589.

Cap. 32.

Can. 26. *vide Zonaram in hunc Canonem.*

dispensed by a Clergy steward, κατ' οἰκόνομον τοῦ ἰδίου ἐπισκόπου, *according to the pleasure or sentence of the Bishop.*

Videatur Concil. Carthag. Græc. can. 36. 38. & 41. & Balsam. ibid. & apologia 2. Iustini Martyris.

§ 39. Forbidding Presbyters to leave their own Dioceſſe, or to travell without leave of the Bishop.

ADde to this, that without the *Bishop's* dimissory letters Presbyters might not goe to another Dioceſſe. So it is decreed in the *fifteenth Canon* of the *Apostles*, under paine of suspension or deposition, μηκέτι λειτουργεῖν is the censure; and that especially, εἰ προσκαλεσαμένου αὐτὸν τοῦ Ἐπισκόπου αὐτοῦ, ἐπανελθεῖν οὐκ ἠθέλησεν, *if he would not returne when his Bishop calls him.* The same is renewed in the Councell of *Antioch*, *cap.* 3. and in the Councell of *Constantinople in Trullo*, *cap.* 17. the censure there is, καθαιρείσθω καὶ αὐτὸς, *let him be deposed that shall without dimissory letters from his Bishop*, ἐν ἑτέρᾳ καταστῆναι Ἐκκλησίᾳ, *fix him-selfe in the Dioceſſe of another Bishop.* But with licenſe of his Bishop, he may. *Sacerdotes, vel alii Clerici concessione suorum Episcoporum possunt ad alias Ecclesias transmigrare.* But this is frequently renewed in many other Synodall decrees, these may suffice for this instance.

Vide Concil. Epaun. c. 5. & venet. c. 10.

* But this not leaving the Dioceſſe is not only meant of promotion in another Church, but Clergy men might not travaile from Citty to Citty, without the Bishops licenſe; which is not only an argument of his regiment *in genere politico*, but extends it almost to a *despotick*; But so strict was the Primitive Church in preserving the strictnes of duty, and Clericall subordination to their Bishop, The Councell of *Laodicea* commands a Priest, or Clergy

Can. 41.

gy man ἀνὰ κανονικῶν γραμμάτων μὴ ὁδεύειν, not to travail without Canonicall, or dimissory letters. And who are to grant these letters, is expressed in the next Canon which repeats the same prohibition, Can. 42. ὅτι οὐ δεῖ ἱερατικὸν ἢ κληρικὸν ἀνὰ κελεύσεως ἐπισκόπου ὁδεύειν, *a Priest or a Clerke must not travaile without the command of his Bishop*; and this prohibition is inserted into the body of the Law, *de consecrat. dist* 5. *can. non oportet*, which puts in the clause of [*Neq; etiam Laicum*,] but this was beyond the Councell. The same is in the Councell of [a] *Agatho*. The Councell of [b] *Venice* adds a cēsure, that those Clerks should be like persons excommunicate in all those places whither they went, without letters of license from their Bishop. The same penalty is inflicted by the Councell of *Epaunum*, *Presbytero, vel Diacono sine Antistitis sui Epistolis ambulanti communionem nullus impendat*. The first Councell of *Tourayne* in France, and the third Councell of *Orleans* attest the self same power in the *Bishop*, and duty in all his Clergy.

[a] Can. 38. [b] Can. 5. Can. 6.

§ 40. And the Bishop had power to preferre which of his Clerks he pleased,

BUT a Coërcitive authority makes not a complete jurisdiction, unlesse it be also remunerative, & [*the Princes of the Nations are called* εὐεργέται *Benefactors*] for it is but halfe a tye to indeare obedience, when the Subject only fears *quod prodesse non poterit, that which cannot profit*. And therefore the primitive Church, to make the Episcopall jurisdiction up intire, gave power to the *Bishop* to present the Clerks of his Dioceſſe to the higher Orders

and neerer degrees of approximation to himselfe, and the Clerks might not refuse to be so promoted. *Item placuit ut quicunq; Clerici vel Diaconi pro necessitatibus Ecclesiarum non obtemperaverint* EPISCOPIS SUIS VOLENTIBUS EOS AD HONOREM AMPLIOREM IN SUA ECCLESIA PROMOVERE, *nec illic ministrent in gradu suo unde recedere noluerunt.* So it is decreed in the *African Code*, *They that will not by their Bishop be promoted to a Greater honour in the Church, must not enjoy what they have already.*

Can. 31.

But it is a question of great consideration, and worth a strict inquiry, in whom the right and power of electing Clerks was resident in the Primitive Church: for the right and the power did not alwaies goe together, and also severall Orders had severall manner of election; Presbyters and inferior Clergy were chosen by the *Bishop* alone, the *Bishop* by a Synod of *Bishops*, or by their Chapter; And lastly, because of late, strong outcries are made upon severall pretensions, amongst which the people make the biggest noise, though of all, their title to election of Clerks be most empty, therefore let us consider it upon all its grounds.

1. In the Acts of the *Apostles*, which are most certainely the best precedents for all acts of holy Church we find that [*Paul and Barnabas ordain'd Elders in every Church*] and [*they passed thorough Lystra, Iconium, Antioch, and Derbe* χειροτονήσαντες αὐτοῖς πρεσβυτέρους, *appointing them Elders.* * S. *Paul* chose *Timothy* *Bishop of Ephesus*, and he saies of him-

himselfe and *Titus*, [*For this cause I* SENT *thee to Crete*, ἵνα καταστήσῃς κατὰ πόλιν πρεσβυτέρους, *that thou shouldest oppoint Presbyters, or Bishops* (be they which they will) *in every City*]. The word καταστήσῃς, signifies that the whole action was his. For that he ordain'd them no man questions, but he also APPOINTED THEM, and that was, saith S. *Paul*, ὡς ἐγώ σοι διεταξάμην, *as I commanded thee*. It was therefore an *Apostolicall* ordinance, that the BISHOP SHOULD APPOINT PRESBYTERS. Let there be halfe so much showne for the people, and I will also indeavour to promote their interest. **** There is onely one pretence of a popular election in Scripture; It is of the seven that were set over the widdowes. * But first, this was no part of the *hierarchy*: This was no cure of soules: This was no divine institution: It was in the dispensation of monyes: it was by command of the *Apostles* the election was made, and they might recede from their owne right: it was to satisfye the multitude: it was to avoid scandall, which in the dispensation of moneyes might easily arise: it was in a temporary office: it was with such limitations, and conditions as the Apostles prescrib'd them: it was out of the number of the 70 that the election was made, if we may beleive S. *Epiphanus*, so that they were Presbyters before this choice: and lastly, it was onely a Nomination of seven Men, the determination of the businesse, and the authority of rejection was still in the *Apostles*, and indeed the whole power [*Whom* WE MAY APPOINT *over this businesse*] & after all this,

1. Titus. V: 5.

there can be no hurt done by the objection, especially since clearely and indubiously the election of *Bishops*, and *Presbyters* was in the *Apostles* owne persons (ὁ πρῶτος ἐτεχειρίσθη παρὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων τῷ ὑμετέραν παροικίαν, saith S. *Ignatius* of *Evodias*; *Evodias was first* APPOINTED *to be your Governour*, *or Bishop*, *by the* APOSTLES) and themselves did committ it to others that were *Bishops*, as in the instances before reckoned. Thus the case stood in Scripture.

Epist. ad Antioch.

2. In the practice of the Church it went according to the same law, and practice *Apostolicall*. The People did not, might not choose the Ministers of holy Church. So the Councell of *Laodicea*, περὶ τοῦ μὴ τὸν ὄχλον ἐπιτρέπειν τὰς ἐκλογὰς ποιεῖσθαι τῶν μελλόντων καθίστασθαι εἰς ἱερατεῖον. *The people must not choose those that are to be promoted to the Priesthood.* The prohibition extends to their Non-election of all the Superiour Clergy, *Bishops* and *Presbyters*. But who then must elect them? The Councell of *Nice* determines that, for in 16 and 17 Canons the Councell forbids any promotion of Clerks to be made, but by the Bishop of that Church where they are first ordayned, which clearely reserves to the *Bishop* the power of retayning, or promoting all his Clergy.

Can. 13.

* 3. All Ordinations were made by *Bishops* alone, (as I have already prooved.) Now let this be confronted with the practice of Primitive Christendome, that no Presbyter might be ordain'd *sine titulo* without a particular charge, which was alwaies custome, and at last grew to be a law in the Councell

Councell of *Chalcedon*, and we shall perceive that the ordainer was the onely chooser; for then to ordaine a Presbyter was also to give him a charge; and the Patronage of a Church was not a lay inheritance, but part of the *Bishops* cure, for he had φροντίδα τῶν Ἐκκλησιῶν ἐν πόλει, καὶ χώρᾳ, *the care of the Churches in all the Dioceſſe*; as I have already shewne. And therefore when S. *Ierome*, according to the custome of Christendome, had specified some particular ordinations or election of Presbyters by *Bishops*, as how himselfe was made Priest by *Paulinus*, and *Paulinus* by *Epiphanius* of *Cyprus*, *Gaudeat Episcopus judicio suo, cùm tales Christo elegerit Sacerdotes, let the Bishop rejoyce in his owne act, having chosen such worthy Priests for the service of Christ.* *Epist. 61. & 62.* *Hieron. ad Nepotian.*

Thus S. *Ambrose* gives intimation that the dispensing all the offices in the Clergy was solely in the *Bishop*. *Hæc spectet Sacerdos, & quod cuiq; congruat, id officij deputet. Let the Bishop observe these rules, and appoint every one his office as is best answerable to his condition and capacity.* And *Theodoret* reports of *Leontius* the *Bishop* of *Antioch*, how being an *Arian*, *adversarios recti dogmatis suscipiens, licèt turpem habentes vitam, ad Presbyteratûs tamen ordinem, & Diaconatûs evexit. Eos autem qui Universis virtutibus ornabantur, & Apostolica dogmata defendebant, abs q; honore deseruit.* He advanc'd his owne faction, but would not promote any man that was Catholike and pious. So he did. The power therefore of Clericall promotion was in his owne hands. This thing is evident and notorious; And there is scarce *lib. 1. offic. cap. 44.* *Tripart. hist. lib. 5. cap. 32.*

any

any example in Antiquity of either Presbyters, or people choosing any Priest, but only in the case of S. *Austin* whom the Peoples hast snatch'd, and carried him to their *Bishop Valerius* intreating him to ordayne him Priest. This indeed is true, that the testimony of the people, for the life of them that were to be ordayn'd was by S. *Cyprian* ordinarily required; *In ordinandis Clericis (Fratres Charissimi) solemus vos ante consulere, & mores, ac merita singulorum communi consilio ponderare.* It was his custome to advise with his people concerning the publike fame of Clerks to be ordayn'd; It was usuall (I say) with him, but not perpetuall, for it was otherwise in the case of *Celerinus*, and divers others, as I shewed elsewhere.

lib. 1. *Epist.* 5.

4. In election of *Bishops* (though not of Priests) the Clergy and the people had a greater actuall interest, and did often intervene with their silent consenting suffrages, or publike acclamations. But first; This was not necessary. It was otherwise among the *Apostles*, and in the case of *Timothy*, of *Titus*, of S. *Iames*, of S. *Marke*, and all the Successors whom they did constitute in the severall chayres. 2*ly*. This was not by law, or right, but in fact only. It was against the Canon of the *Laodicean* Councell, and the 31th Canon of the *Apostles*, which under paine of deposition commands that a *Bishop* be not promoted to his Church by the intervening of any lay power.

Against this discourse S. *Cyprian* is strongly pretended. *Quando ipsa [plebs] maximè habeat potestatem*

Epist. 68.

tem vel eligendi dignos Sacerdotes, vel indignos recusandi. Quod & ipsum videmus de divinâ authoritate descendere &c. Thus he is usually cited. *The people have power to choose, or to refuse their Bishops, and this comes to them from Divine authority.* No such matter. The following words expound him better, [*Quod & ipsum videmus de divinâ authoritate descendere, ut Sacerdos* PLEBE PRÆSENTE *sub omnium oculis deligatur, & dignus, atq; idoneus publico judicio ac testimonio comprobetur: that the Bishop is chosen publikely, in the presence of the people, and he only be thought fit who is approved by publike judgement, and testimony*; or as S. *Paul's* phrase is [*he must have a good report of all men*] that is indeed a divine institution, and that to this purpose, and for the publike attestation of the act of election and ordination the peoples presence was required, appeares clearely by S. *Cyprian's* discourse in this Epistle. For what is the *divine authority* that he mentions? It is only the example of *Moses* whom God commanded to take the Sonne of *Eleazer* and cloath him with his Fathers robes *coram omni Synagogâ, before all the congregation.* The people chose not, God chose *Eleazar*, and *Moses* consecrated him, and the people stood, and look'd on; that's all that this argument can supply. * Iust thus *Bishops* are, and ever were ordayn'd, *non nisi sub populi assistentis conscientiâ, in the sight of the people standing by*; but to what end? *Vt plebe præsente detegantur malorum crimina, vel bonorum merita prædicentur.* All this while the election is not in the people, nothing but the

publike testimony, and examination, for so it followes, *& sit ordinatio justa & legitima quæ omnium suffragio, & judicio fuerit examinata.*

** But S. *Cyprian* hath two more proof's whence we may learne either the sense, or the truth of his assertion. The one is of the *Apostles* ordayning the seven Deacons (but this we have already examin'd,) the other of S. *Peter* choosing S. *Matthias* into the *Apostolate*; it was indeed done in the presence of the people. * But here it is considerable that at this surrogation of S. *Matthias* the Number of the persons present was but 120, of which eleven were Apostles, and 72 were Disciples and Presbyters, they make up 83, and then there remaines but 37 of the Laity, of which many were women, which I know not yet whether any man would admitt to the election of an *Apostle*, and whether they doe or doe not, the Laity is a very inconsiderable Number if the matter had beene to be carried by plurality of voices; so that let the worst come that is imaginable, the whole businesse was in effect carried by the Clergy, whom in this case we have no reason to suspect to be divided, and of a distinct, or disagreeing interest.* 2. Let this discourse be of what validity it will, yet all this whole businesse was miraculous, and extraordinary; For though the *Apostles* nam'd two Candidates yet the *holy Ghost* chose them by particular revelation. And yet for all this, it was lawfull for S. *Peter* alone to have done it without casting lots. *An non licebat ipsi* [*Petro*] *eligere? licebat, & quidem maximè; verùm id non facit*

facit ne cui videretur gratificari. Quanquam alioqui non erat particeps Spiritûs. For all, he had not as yet received the holy Ghost, yet he had power himselfe to have completed the election. So S. *Chrysostome.* *homil. 3. in Act.*

So that now, if S. *Cyprian* meanes more then the presence of the people for suffrage of publike testimony, & extends it to a suffrage of formall choice, his proofes of the divine authority are invalid, there is no such thing can be deduc'd from thence, and then this is his *complying so much with the people* (which hath beene the fault of many a good man) may be reckon'd together with his *rebaptization.* But truth is, he meanes no more then suffrage of testimony, viz: That he who is to be chosen *Bishop* be for his good life a man of good fame, and approved of before God and all the people, and this is all the share they have in their election. * And so indeed himselfe summes up the whole businesse and tells us of another *jus Divinum* too. [*Propter quod diligenter de traditione Divinâ, & Apostolicâ observatione, observandum est & tenendum, quod apud nos quoq;, & ferè apud Provincias Universas tenetur, ut ad ordinationes ritè celebrandas ad eam plebem cui Præpositus ordinatur, Episcopi ejusdem provinciæ proximi quiq; conveniant, & Episcopus deligatur plebe præsente quæ singulorum vitam plenissimè novit. It is most diligently to be observed, for there "is a Divine tradition, and an Apostolicall ordinance "for it, and it is us'd by us and almost by all Churches, "that all the Bishops of the Province assemble to the*

"*making of right ordinations, and that a Bishop be*
"*chosen in the face of the people who best know their*
"*life and conversation.*] So that the *Bishops* were to make the formall election, the people to give their judgement of approbation *in this particular*, and so much as concern'd the exemplary piety, and good life of him that was to be their *Bishop*. Here we see in S. *Cyprian* is a *jus Divinum* for the *Bishops* choosing a Collegue, or a Brother-*Bishop*, as much as for the presence of the people, and yet the presence was all. And howsoever the people were present to give this testimony, yet the election was clearely in the *Bishops*, and that by *Divine tradition*, and *Apostolicall observation* saith S. *Cyprian*; And thus it was in all Churches almost.

Epist. 120. *lib.* 3. *de Sacerd.* In *Africa* this was, and so it continued till after S. *Austins* time, particularly in the choice of *Eradius* his successor. It was so in the Greek Church as S. *Chrysostome* tels us. It was so in † *Spaine*, as S. † *Isidore* tels us; and in many other places, that the people should be present, and give acclamation, and tumultuary approbation; but to the formall election of the Clergy, made by enumeration of votes and subscription, the people never were admitted.

† *lib.* 2. *de offic.*

5. Although that in times of persecution, at first, and to comply with the people who were in all respects to be sweetned, to make them with easier appetite swallow the bitter pill of persecution, and also to make them more obedient to their *Bishop*, if they did, though but in a tumult and noyse cry him up in his ordination, *ne plebs invita Episcopum non optatum*,

tatum, aut contemnat, aut oderit, & fiat minùs religiosa quàm convenit, cui non licuerit habere quem voluit, (for so S. *Leo* expresses the cause) yet the formality, and right of proper election was in the Clergy, and often so practised without any consent at all, or intervening act of the people. The right, I say, was in the *Bishops*, so it was decreed in the *Nicene* Councell, ὅπως παρὰ μᾶλλον μὲν ὑπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐν τῇ ἐπαρχίᾳ καθίστασθαι. *The Bishop must be appointed or constituted by all the* BISHOPS *of the province*, τὸ δὲ κρατεῖν τὰ γινόμενα δίδοσθαι κατ' ἐκάστην ἐπαρχίαν τῷ μητροπολίτῃ. *It must be confirm'd, and established by the* METROPOLITAN. No Presbyters here all this while, no people. * But the exercise of this power is more clearely seen in the Acts of some Councells, where the Fathers degraded some *Bishops*, and themselves appointed others in their Roomes. * The *Bishops* in the Councell of *Constantinople* deposed *Marcellus. In cujus locum Basilium in Ancyram miserunt.* They sent *Basilius* Bishop in his roome, saith *Sozomen.* * *Ostendat* Basianus *si per Synodum Reverendissimorum Episcoporũ, & consuetâ lege Episcopus Ephesiorum Metropolis est constitutus,* (said the Fathers of the Councell of *Chalcedõ.*) *Let* Basianus *show that he was made* BISHOP OF EPHESUS BY A SYNOD OF BISHOPS, *and according to the accustomed Law.* The Law I shewed before, even the *Nicene* Canon. The fathers of which Councell sent a Synodall Epistle to the Church of *Alexandria*, to tell them they had deposed *Militius* from the office of a *Bishop*, only left him the name, but took from him all pow-

Epist. 84. c. 5.

Can. 4.

Tripart. hist. lib. 3. *cap.* 9.

Act. 11.

Tripart. hist. lib. 2. cap. 12. er, *nullam verò omnimodò habere potestatem, neq;* ELIGENDI, NEQUE ORDINANDI: *&c.* Neither suffering him to choose nor to ordaine Clerks. It seems then that was part of the Episcopall office in ordinary, *placitos sibi eligere*, as the Epistle expresses it in the sequell, *to choose whom they listed.* But the Councell deposed *Melitius*, and sent *Alexander* their *Bishop*, and *Patriarch* to rule the Church againe. ** And particularly to come home to the case of the present question, when *Auxentius Bishop of Millaine* was dead, and the *Bishops* of the Province; and the Clergy of the Church, and the people of the Citty, were assembled at the choosing of another, the Emperour makes a speech to the *Bishops* only, that they should be carefull in their choyce. So that although the people were present, *quibus pro fide, & religione etiam honor deferendus est* (as S. *Cyprians* phrase is) *to whom respect is to be had, and faire complyings to be used so long as they are pious*, catholick, and obedient, yet both the right of electing, and solemnity of ordaining was in the *Bishops*, the peoples interest did not arrive to one halfe of this.

Theodor. lib. 4. c. 5.

6. There are in Antiquity diverse precedents of Bishops, who chose their own successors; it will not be imagined the people will choose a Bishop over his head, and proclaime that they were weary of him. In those daies they had more piety. * *Agelius* did so, he chose *Sisinnius*, and that it may appeare it was without the people, they came about him, and intreated him to choose *Marcian*, to whom

whom they had been beholding in the time of *Valens* the Emperour; he complyed with them, and appointed *Marcian* to be his succeſſor, and *Siſinnius* whom he had firſt choſen, to ſucceed *Marcian.* * Thus did *Valerius* chooſe his ſucceſſor, S. *Auſtin*; for though the people nam'd him for their Prieſt, and carried him to *Valerius* to take Orders, yet *Valerius* choſe him *Biſhop.* And this was uſuall; ὡς ἐν ἄλλαις πόλεσι, (as *Epiphanius* expreſſes this caſe,) it was ordinary to doe ſo in many Churches. *Socrat. lib. 5. c. 21.*

7. The manner of election in many Churches was various, for although indeed the Church had commanded it, and given power to the Biſhops to make the election, yet in ſome times and in ſome Churches the Presbyters, or the Chapter, choſe one out of themſelves. S. *Hierome* ſaies they alwaies did ſo in *Alexandria*, from S. *Markes* time to *Heraclas* and *Dionyſius.* * S. *Ambroſe* ſaies that at the firſt, the *Biſhop* was not, by a formall new election promoted, but *recedente uno ſequens ei ſuccedebat. As one dyed ſo the next ſenior did ſucceed him.* In both theſe caſes no mixture of the peoples votes. *In Ephes. 4.*

8. In the Church of *England* the people were never admitted to the choyce of a *Biſhop* from its firſt becoming Chriſtian to this very day, and therefore to take it from the Clergy, in whom it alwaies was by permiſſion of Princes, and to intereſt the people in it, is to recede *à traditionibus Majorum*, from the religion of our forefathers, and to INNOVATE in a high proportion.

9. In thoſe Churches where the peoples ſuffrage (by

(by way of testimony, I meane, and approbation) did concurre with the Synod of *Bishops* in the choyce of a *Bishop*, the people at last according to their usuall guise grew hot, angry, and tumultuous, and then were ingaged by divisions in religion to Name a *Bishop* of their own sect; and to disgrace one another by publike scandall, and contestation, and often grew up to Sedition, and Murder; and therefore although they were never admitted, (unlesse where themselves usurped) farther then I have declared, yet even this was taken from them, especially, since in tumultuary assemblies, they were apt to carry all before them, they knew not how to distinguish between power, and right, they had not well learn'd to take deniall, but began to obtrude whom they listed, to swell higher like a torrent when they were check'd; and the soleship of election, which by the Ancient Canons was in the *Bishops*, they would have asserted wholly to themselves both in right, and execution.

* I end this with the annotation of *Zonaras* upon the *twelfth Canon* of the *Laodicean Councell*. *Populi suffragiis olim Episcopi eligebantur* (understand him in the senses above explicated) *Sed cùm multæ inde seditiones existerent, hinc factum est ut Episcoporum Vniuscujusq; provinciæ authoritate eligi Episcopum quemq; oportere decreverint Patres: of old time Bishops were chosen, not without the suffrage of the people* (for they concurred by way of testimony and acclamation) *but when this occasion'd many seditions and tumults, the Fathers decreed that a Bi-*

shop

shop should be chosen by the authority of the Bishops of the Province. And he addes that in the election of *Damasus* 137 men were slaine, and that sixe hundred examples more of that nature were producible.

Truth is, the Nomination of *Bishops* in Scripture was in the *Apostles* alone, and though the Kindred of our *Blessed Saviour* were admitted to the choyce of *Simeon Cleophæ*, the Successor of S. *Iames* to the Bishoprick of *Ierusalem*, as *Eusebius* witnesses; it was *propter singularem honorem*, an honorary, and extraordinary priviledge indulged to them for their vicinity and relation to our Blessed Lord the fountaine of all benison to us; and for that very reason *Simeon* himselfe was chosen *Bishop* too. Yet this was *præter regulam Apostolicam.* The rule of the *Apostles*, and their precedents were for the sole right of the *Bishops* to choose their Colleagues in that Sacred order. * And then in descent, even before the *Nicene Councell* the people were forbidden to meddle in election, for they had no authority by Scripture to choose; by the necessity of times and for the reasons before asserted they were admitted to such a share of the choyce as is now folded up in a peice of paper, even to a testimoniall; and yet I deny not but they did often take more as in the case of *Nilammon*, *quem cives elegerunt*, saith the story out of *Sozomen*, they chose him alone, (though God took away his life before himselfe would accept of their choyce) and then they behav'd themselves oftentimes with so much in-

lib. 3. hist. cap. 11.

Tripart. hist. lib. 10. c. 14.

solency, partiality, faction, sedition, cruelty, and Pagan baseneſſe that they were quite interdicted it, above 1200 yeares agone. * So that they had their little in poſſeſſion but a little while, and never had any due, and therefore now, their requeſt for it is no petition of right, but a popular ambition and a ſnatching at a ſword to hew the Church in peices.

vide diſt. 63. per tot. Gratian.

But I thinke I need not have troubled my ſelfe halfe ſo farre, for they that ſtrive to introduce a popular election, would as faine have *Epiſcopacy* out, as popularity of election let in. So that all this of popular election of *Biſhops*, may ſeeme ſuperfluous. For I conſider, that if the peoples power of chooſing *Biſhops* be founded upon *Gods law*, as ſome men pretend from S. *Cyprian* (not proving the thing from Gods law, but Gods law from S. *Cyprian*) then *Biſhops* themſelves muſt be by *Gods law*: For ſurely God never gave them power to chooſe any man into that office which himſelfe hath no way inſtituted. And therefore I ſuppoſe theſe men will deſiſt from their pretence of *Divine right of popular election*, if the Church will recede from her *divine right of Epiſcopacy*. But for all their plundering, and confounding, their bold pretences have made this diſcourſe neceſſary.

§ 41. Biſhops onely did Vote in Councells and neither Presbyters, nor People.

IF we adde to all theſe foregoing particulars the power of making lawes to be in *Biſhops*, nothing elſe can be required to the making up of a ſpirituall Principality. Now as I have ſhewne that the *Biſhop* of every Dioceſſe did give lawes to his owne Church

Church for particulars, so it is evident that the lawes of Provinces and of the Catholike Church, were made by conventions of Bishops without the intervening, or concurrence of Presbyters, or any else for sentence and decision.

The instances of this are just so many as there are Councells. S. *Athanasius* reprehending *Constantius* the *Arian* for interposing in the Conciliary determinations of faith, *si judicium Episcoporum est* (saith he) *quid cum eo commune habet Imperator? It is a judgment to be pass'd* By Bishops, (meaning the determination of the article,) *and not proper for the Emperour.* And when *Hosius* of *Corduba* reprov'd him for sitting President in a Councell, *Quis enim videns eum* In Decernendo Principem Se Facere Episcoporum, *non meritò dicat illum eam ipsam abhominationem desolationis?* He that sits President, makes *himselfe chiefe of the* Bishops, &c. intimating Bishops only to preside in Councells, and to make decision. And therefore *conventus Episcoporum*, and *Concilium Episcoporum* are the words for Generall, and Provinciall Councells. *Bis in anno Episcoporum Concilia celebrentur*, said the 38th Canon of the *Apostles*; and *Congregatio Episcopalis* the Councell of *Sardis* is call'd by *Theodoret*. And when the Question was started in the time of Pope *Victor* about the celebration of *Easter*, *ob quam causam* (saith *Eusebius*) *conventus Episcoporum, & Concilia per singulas quasq; provincias convocantur.* Where by the way, it is to be observable, that at first, even provinciall Synods were onely held by Bishops,

Epist. ad Solitar.

lib. 2. cap. 7.

lib. 5. cap. 23.

and Presbyters had no interest in the decision; however we have of late sate so neere *Bishops* in Provinciall assemblies, that we have sate upon the *Bishops* skirts. But my Lords the Bishops have a concerning interest in this. To them I leave it; And because the foure generall Councells are the Precedents and chiefe of all the rest, I shall only instance in them for this particular.

1. The title of the *Nicene* Councell runs thus, Κανόνες τῶν τριακοσίων δεκαοκτὼ ἁγίων πατέρων τῶν ἐν Νικαίᾳ συνελθόντων. *The Canons of the* 318 *Fathers met in Nice.* These Fathers were all that gave suffrage to the Canons, for if there had been more, the title could not have appropriated the Sanction to 318. And that there were no more S. *Ambrose* gives testimony in that he makes it to be a mysticall number; *Nam & Abraham trecentos decem & octo duxit ad bellum .... De Conciliis id potissimùm sequor quod trecenti decem & octo Sacerdotes .... velut trophæum extulerunt, ut mihi videatur hoc esse Divinum, quod eodem numero in Conciliis, fidei habemus oraculum, quo in historiâ, pietatis exemplum.* Well! 318 was the Number of the Iudges, the *Nicene* Fathers, and they were all *Bishops*, for so is the title of the subscriptions, *Subscripserunt trecenti decem & octo* EPISCOPI *qui in eodem Concilio convenerunt*; 13. whereof were *Chorepiscopi*, but not one Presbyter, save onely that *Vitus*, and *Vincentius*, subscribed as legates of the *Bishop of Rome*, but not by their owne authority.

proëm. in lib. de fide.

2. The great Councell of *Constantinople* was celebra-

celebrated by 150 *Bishops*: κανόνες τῶν ἑκατὸν πεντήκοντα ἁγίων πατέρων τῶν ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει συνελθόντων, That's the title of the Canons. *The Canons of* 150 *holy Fathers who met in C. P.* and that these were all *Bishops* appeares by the title of S. *Gregory Nazianzen's* oration in the beginning of the Councell. τῆς ἁγίας Γρηγορείου τοῦ Ναζιανζηνοῦ συνταχτήριος εἰς τὴν τῶν ἑκατὸν πεντήκοντα ἐπισκόπων παρουσίαν. *The oration of S. Gregory Nazianzen in the presence of* 150 *Bishops*. And of this Councell it was that *Socrates* speaking, *Imperator* (saith he) *nullâ morâ interpositâ Concilium* EPISCOPORUM *convocat*. Here indeed some few Bishops appear'd by Proxy as *Montanus Bishop of Claudiopolis* by *Paulus* a Presbyter, and *Atarbius Bishop of Pontus* by *Cylus* a Reader, and about some fowre or five more. * This onely, amongst the subscriptions I find *Tyrannus*, *Auxanon*, *Helladius*, and *Elpidius* calling themselves Presbyters. But their modesty hinders not the truth of the former testimonies; They were Bishops, saith the title of the Councell, and the Oration, and the Canons, and *Socrates*; And least there be scruple concerning *Auxanon Presbyter Apameæ*, because before, *Iohannes Apameensis* subscribed, which seemes to intimate that one of them was the *Bishop*, and the other but a Presbyter indeed, without a subterfuge of modesty, the titles distinguishes them. For *Iohn* was *Bishop* in the Province of *Cæle Syria*, and *Auxanon of Apamea in Pisidia*. lib. 5. cap. 8.

3. The third was the Councell of *Ephesus*, *Episcoporum plurium quàm ducentorum*, as is often said

in the acts of the Councell [*of above* 200 *Bishops.*] But no Presbyters, for, *Cùm Episcopi supra ducentos extiterint qui Nestorium deposuerunt, horum subscriptionibus contenti fuimus. We were content with the subscription of the* 200 *and odde Bishops*, saith the Councell; and *Theodosius* junior, in his Epistle to the Synod, *Illicitum est* (saith he) *eum qui non sit in ordine sanctissimorum Episcoporum Ecclesiasticis immisceri tractatibus. It is unlawfull for any but them who are in the order of the most holy Bishops, to be interest in Ecclesiasticall assemblies.*

Epist Synod. ad Clerum C. Ptanum. part. 2. act. 3. part. 1. c. 32.

Vide §. 36. *de simil. ferè quæstione in fine.*

4. The last of the foure great conventions of Christendome was, *sexcentorum triginta Episcoporum, of* 630 *Bishops at Chalcedon in Bithynia.* But in all these assemblies, no meere Presbyters gave suffrage except by legation from his *Bishop*, and delegation of authority. And therefore when in this Councell *some Laicks*, and *some Monks*, and *some Clergy-men, not Bishops*, would interest themselves *Pulcheria* the Empresse sent letters to *Consularius* to repell them by force; *si præter nostram evocationem, aut permissionem suorum Episcoporum ibidem commorantur, who come without command of the Empresse, or the Bishops permission.* Where it is observeable that the Bishops might bring Clerks with them to assist, to dispute, and to be present in all the action; And thus they often did suffer *Abbots*, or *Archimandrites* to be there, and to subscribe too, but that was *præter regulam*, and by indulgence only, and condescension; For when *Martinus* the *Abbot* was requested to subscribe he answered, *Non*

Action. 1. Concil. Chalced.

suum esse, sed Episcoporum tantùm subscribere, it belong'd only to Bishops *to subscribe to Councells.* For this reason the Fathers themselves often call'd out in the Councell, *Mitte foras superfluos, Concilium Episcoporum est.*

But I need not more particular arguments, for till the Councell of *Basil*, the Church never admitted Presbyters as in their own right to voyce in Councells, and that Councell we know favourd too much of the Schismatick, but before this Councell, no example, no president of subscriptions of the Presbyters either to Oecumenicall, or Provinciall Synods. Indeed to a Diocesan Synod, *viz.* that of *Auxerre* in *Burgundy*, I find 32 *Presbyters* subscribing. This Synod was neither Oecumenicall nor Provinciall, but meerely the Convocation of a Diocesse. For here was but one *Bishop*, and some few *Abbots*, and 32 *Presbyters*. It was indeed no more then a visitation, or the calling of a Chapter, for of this we receive intimation in the *seaventh Canon* of that assembly, *ut in medio Maio omnes Presbyteri ad Synodum venirent*, that was their summons, *& in Novembri omnes Abbates ad Concilium*: so that here is intimation of a yearely Synod besides the first convention, the greatest of them but Diocesan, and therefore the lesser but *conventus Capitularis*, or however not enough to give evidence of a subscription of *Presbyters* to so much as a Provinciall Councell. For the guise of Christendome was alwaies otherwise, and therefore it was the best argument that the Bishops in the *Arian* hurry used to acquit

Concil. Antiodor. can. 7.

quit themselves from the suspition of heresy, *Neq;*
Socrat. lib. 2. c. 7. *nos sumus Arii sectatores; Quî nam, fieri potest, ut cùm simus Episcopi Ario Presbytero auscultemus?* Bishops never receive determination of any article from Priests, but Priests doe from Bishops. *Nam*
Epist. 3. per Ruffinum. *vestrum est eos instruere* (saith S. *Clement* speaking of the Bishops office and power over Priests and all the Clergy, and all the Dioceſſe) *eorum est vobis obedire, ut Deo cujus legatione fungimini.* And a little after; *Audire ergo eum attentiùs oportet, & ab ipso suscicere doctrinam fidei, monita autem vitæ à Presbyteris inquirere.* Of the Priests we must inquire for rules of good life, but of the Bishop receive positions and determinations of faith.

Against this if it be objected, *Quod omnes tangit ab omnibus tractari debet, That which is of generall concernement, must also be of generall Scrutiny.* I answer, it is true, unlesse where God himselfe hath intrusted the care of others in a body, as he hath in the *Bishops*, and will require the soules of his Dioceſſe at his hand, and commanded us to requite the
Hebr. 13. 7. & 17. 1. Pet. 5. 2. Act. 20. Law at their mouths, *and to follow their faith,* whom he hath set over us. And therefore the determination of Councells pertains to all, and is handled by all, not in diffusion but in representation. For, *Ecclesia est in Episcopo, & Episcopus in Ecclesiâ,*
Epist. 69. (saith *S. Cyprian*) *the Church is in the Bishop* (*viz.* by representment) *and the Bishop is in the Church* (*viz.* as a Pilot in a ship, or a Master in a family, or rather as a steward, and Guardian to rule in his Masters absence) and for this reason the *Synod* of the *Nicene*

Nicene Bishops is called (in *Eusebius*) *conventus orbis terrarum*, and by S. *Austin*, *consensus totius Ecclesiæ*, not that the whole Church was there present in their severall persons, but was there represented by the Catholike *Bishops*, and if this representment be not sufficient for obligation to all, I see no reason but the Ladyes too, may vote in Councells, for I doubt not, but they have soules too. *Lib. 3. de vitâ Constant. lib. de baptis. cap. 18.*

But however, if this argument were concluding in it selfe, yet it looses its force in *England*, where the Clergy are bound by Lawes of *Parliament*, and yet in the capacity of Clergy-men are allowed to choose neither Procurators to represent us as Clergy, nor Knights of the shire to represent us as Commons. * In conclusion of this I say to the Presbyters as S. *Ambrose* said of the Lay-judges, whom the Arians would have brought to judge in Councell (it was an old hereticall trick.) *Veniant planè si qui sunt ad Ecclesiam, audiant cum populo, non ut* QUISQUAM IUDEX *residеat, sed unusquisq; de suo affectu habeat examen, & eligat quem sequatur.* So may Presbyters be present, so they may judge, not for others, but for themselves. And so may the people be present, and anciently were so; and therefore Councells were alwaies kept in open Churches, [*ubi populus judicat*] not for others, but for themselves, not by externall sentence, but internall conviction, so S. *Ambrose* expounds himselfe in the forecited allegation. *Epist. 32.*

There is no considerable objection against this discourse but that of the first *Councell of Ierusalem*;

where the *Apostles*, and ELDERS did meet together to DETERMINE of the question of circumcision. For although in the story of celebration of it, we find no man giving sentence but *Peter*, and *Iames*; yet in 16. *Acts*, they are called δόγματα κεκριμένα ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀποστόλων καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, *decrees* JUDGED *by the Apostles, and Elders*. But first, in this the difficulty is *the lesse*, becaus̃e [*Presbyter*] was a generall word for all that were not of the number of the twelve, *Prophets*, *Evangelists*, *Pastors*, and *Doctors*. And then secondly, it is *none at all*, becaus̃e *Paul*, and *Barnabas* are signally, and by name reckoned as present in the Synod, and one of them Prolocutor, or else both. So that such Presbyters may well define in such conventuall assemblies. 3. If yet there were any difficulty latent in the story, yet the Catholick practice of Gods Church, is certainly the best expositor of such places where there either is any difficulty, or where any is pretended. And of this, I have already given account.

* I remember also that this place is pretended for the peoples power of voycing in Councells. It is a pretty pageant; onely that it is against the Catholick practice of the Church, against the exigence of Scripture, which bids us require the law at the Mouth of our spirituall Rulers, against the gravity of such assemblies, for it would force them to be tumultuous, and at the best, are the worst of Sanctions, as being issues of popularity, and to summe up all, it is no way authoriz'd by this first copy of Christian Councells. The pretence is, in the Synodall

dall * letter written in the name of [*the Apostles, and Elders, and Brethren*] that is, (saies *Geta,*) The *Apostles*, and *Presbyters*, and *People*. But why not BRETHREN, that is, all the *Deacons*, and *Evangelists*, and *Helpers* in Governement, and *Ministers* of the Churches? There is nothing either in words, or circumstances to contradict this. If it be ask'd who then are meant by Elders, if by [*Brethren*] S. *Luke* understands these Church officers? I answer, that here is such variety, that although I am not certain which officers he precisely comprehends under the distinct titles of Elders, and Brethren, yet here are enough to furnish both with variety, and yet neither to admit *meere Presbyters* in the present acceptation of the word, nor yet the *Laity to a decision* of the question, nor authorizing the decretall. For besides the *twelve Apostles*, there were *Apostolicall men* which were Presbyters, and something more, as *Paul* and *Barnabas*, and *Silas*; and *Evangelists*, and *Pastors* besides, which might furnish out the last appellative sufficiently. But however without any further trouble it is evident, that this word [*Brethren*] does not distinguish the Laity from the Clergy. [*Now when they heard this, they were pricked in their hearts, and said unto* PETER, *and to the rest of the* APOSTLES, *Men and* BRETHREN *what shall we doe. Iudas* and *Silas* who were Apostolicall men, are called in Scripture, chiefe men among the BRETHREN. But this is too known, to need a contestation.

* *Acts* 15. 23.

I only insert the saying of *Basilius* the Emperour

in the 8th *Synod. De vobis autem Laicis tam qui in dignitatibus, quàm qui absolutè versamini quid amplius dicam non habeo, quàm quòd nullo modo vobis licet de Ecclesiasticis causis sermonem movere, neq; penitùs resistere integritati Ecclesiæ, & universali Synodo adversari. Lay-men* (saies the Emperour) *must by no means meddle with causes Ecclesiasticall, nor oppose themselves to the Catholick Church, or Councells Oecumenicall.* They must not meddle, for these things appertaine to the cognisance of Bishops and their decision. * And now after all this, what authority is equall to this LEGISLATIVE *of the Bishops?* μάλιστα δ' ὡς ἁπλῶς εἰπεῖν ἀρχῆς λεκτέον τύπος ὅσοις ἀποδίδοῖ), βουλεύσασθαι τὸ περὶ πόλιν, καὶ ἐξεῖναι καὶ ὁπτάξαι, καὶ μάλιστα τοῦτο. τὸ δ' ὁπτάζειν ἀρχικώτερον, (saith *Aristotle.*) They are all evidences of power and authority, to deliberate, to determine, or judge, to make lawes. But to make lawes is the greatest power that is imaginable. The first may belong fairely enough to Presbyters, but I have proved the two latter to be appropriate to Bishops.

Lib. 4. polit. c. 15.

§ 42. And the Bishop had a propriety in the persons of his Clerks,

LAstly, as if all the acts of jurisdiction, and every imaginable part of power were in the *Bishop*, over the Presbyters & subordinate Clergy, the Presbyters are said to be *Episcoporum Presbyteri*, the *Bishops* Presbyters; as having a propriety in them, and therefore a superiority over them, and as the Bishop was a dispenser of those things which were *in bonis Ecclesiæ*, so he was of the persons too, a Ruler in propriety. * S. *Hilary* in the book which him-

himselfe delivered to *Constantine*, *Ecclesiæ adhuc* (saith he) *per Presbyteros* MEOS *communionem distribuens*, *I still give the holy Communion to the faithfull people by* MY *Presbyters*. And therefore in the third Councell of *Carthage* a great deliberation was had about requiring a Clerke of his Bishop, to be promoted in another Church, ... *Deniq; qui unum habuerit numquid debet illi ipse unus Presbyter auferri?* (saith *Posthumianus*.) *If the Bishop have but one Presbyter must that one be taken from him?* *Id sequor* (saith *Aurelius*) *ut conveniam Episcopum ejus, atq; ei inculcem quod ejus Clericus à quâlibet Ecclesiâ postuletur*. And it was resolved, *ut Clericum alienum nisi concedente ejus Episcopo. No man shall retaine another Bishop's without the consent of the Bishop whose Clerk he is.* Can. 45. Concil. Carthag. 3.

* When *Athanasius* was abused by the calumny of the hereticks his adversaries, and entred to purge himselfe, *Athanasius ingreditur cum Timotheo Presbytero* Suo. *He comes in with Timothy* HIS *Presbyter*; and, *Arsenius*, *cujus brachium dicebatur excisum, lector aliquando fuerat Athanasii. Arsenius was Athanasius* HIS *Reader. Vbi autem ventum est ad Rumores de poculo fracto à Macario Presbytero Athanasii, &c. Macarius was another of Athanasius* HIS *Priests*. So *Theodoret*. *Peter*, and *Irenæus* were two more of his Presbyters, as himselfe witnesses. *Paulinianus* comes sometimes to visit us (saith S. *Hierome* to *Pammachius*) but not as your Clerke, *sed ejus à quo ordinatur. His Clerk who did ordaine him.* Eccles. hist. lib. 10. cap. 17. Lib. 2. cap. 8. Athanas. Epist. ad vitam solitar: agentes.

But these things are too known to need a multiplication of instances.

The summe is this. The question was, whether or no, and how farre the *Bishops* had *Superiority over Presbyters* in the Primitive Church. Their doctrine, and practice have furnished us with these particulars. The power of Church goods, and the sole dispensation of them, and a propriety of persons was reserved to the Bishop. For the Clergy, and Church possessions were in his power, in his administration: the Clergy might not travaile without the Bishops leave: they might not be preferred in another Dioceſſe without licenſe of their own Bishop: in their own Churches the Bishop had sole power to preferre them, and they must undertake the burden of any promotion if he calls them to it: without him they might not baptize, not consecrate the Eucharist, not communicate, not reconcile penitents, not preach; not onely, not without his ordination, but not without a speciall faculty besides the capacity of their order: The Presbyters were bound to obey their Bishops in their sanctions, and canonicall impositions, even by the decree of the *Apostles* themselves, and the doctrine of *Ignatius*, and the constitution of *S. Clement*, of the Fathers in the Councell of *Arles*, *Ancyra*, and *Toledo*, and many others: The Bishops were declared to be *Iudges* in ordinary of the Clergy, and people of their Dioceſſe by the concurrent suffrages of almost 2000 holy Fathers assembled in *Nice*, *Ephesus*, *Chalcedon*, in *Carthage*, *Antioch*, *Sardis*, *Aquileia*, *Taurinum*,

Taurinum, *Agatho*, and by the Emperour, and by the *Apoſtles*; and all this atteſted by the conſtant practice of the Biſhops of the Primitive Church inflicting cenſures upon delinquents, and abſolving them as they ſaw cauſe, and by the dogmaticall reſolution of the old Catholicks declaring in their attributes, and appellatives of the *Epiſcopall* function that they have ſupreme, and univerſall ſpirituall power, (*viz.* in the ſenſe above explicated) over all the Clergy and Laity of their Dioceſſe, as, [*that "they are higher then all power, the image of God, "the figure of Chriſt, Chriſts Vicar, Preſident of the "Church. Prince of Prieſts, of authority incompara-"ble, unparalell'd power.*] and many more, if all this be witneſſe enough of the ſuperiority of *Epiſcopall* juriſdiction, we have their depoſitions, wee may proceed as we ſee cauſe for, and reduce our Epiſcopacy to the primitive ſtate, for that is truly a reformation [*id Dominicum quod primum, id hæreticum quod poſterius*] and then we ſhall be ſure Epiſcopacy will looſe nothing by theſe unfortunate conteſtations.

§. 43. Their Iuriſdiction was over many congregations, or Pariſhes,

BUT againſt the cauſe, it is objected *ſuper totam Materiam*, that Biſhops were not Dioceſan, but Parochiall, and therefore of ſo confin'd a juriſdiction that perhaps our Village, or Citty Prieſts ſhall advance their Pulpit, as high as the Biſhops throne.

* Well! put caſe they were not Dioceſan, but pariſh Biſhops, what then? yet they were ſuch Biſhops as had Presbyters, and Deacons in ſubordination

tion to them, in all the particular advantages of the former instances.

2. If the *Bishops* had the Parishes, what cure had the *Priests?* so that this will debase the *Priests* as much as the *Bishops*, and if it will confine a *Bishop* to a *Parish*, it will make that no *Presbyter* can be so much as a *Parish-Priest*. If it brings a *Bishop* lower then a Diocesse, it will bring the *Priest* lower then a *Parish*. For set a *Bishop* where you will, either in a *Diocesse*, or a *Parish*, a *Presbyter* shall still keep the same duty and subordination, the same distance still. So that this objection upon supposition of the former discourse, will no way mend the matter for any side, but make it farre worse, it will not advance the Presbytery, but it will depresse the whole hierarchy, and all the orders of H. Church.

* But because, this trifle is so much used amongst the enimies of *Episcopacy*, I will consider it a little, and besides that it does no body any good advantage, I will represent it in it's *fucus* and show the falsehood of it.

1. Then. It is evident that there were *Bishops* before there were any distinct Parishes. For the first division of Parishes in the West was by *Evaristus*, who lived almost 100 years after Christ, and divided *Rome into seven parishes*, assigning to every one a *Presbyter*. So *Damasus* reports of him in the Pontificall book. *Hic titulos in urbe Româ divisit Presbyteris, & septem Diaconos ordinavit qui custodirent Episcopum prædicantem propter stylum veritatis. He divided the Parishes, or titles in the City of Rome*

Rome to Presbyters. The same also is by *Damasus* reported of *Dionysius* in his life, *hic Presbyteris Ecclesias divisit, & cæmiteria, parochiasq; & diœceses constituit. Marcellus* increased the number in the yeare 305. *Hic fecit cæmiterium viâ Salariâ, & 25 Titulos in urbe Roma constituit quasi diœceses propter baptismum, & pœnitentiam multorum qui convertebantur ex Paganis, & propter sepulturas Martyrum. He made a Sepulture, or cæmitery for the buriall of Martyrs, and appointed 25. Titles or Parishes:* but he addes [*quasi Diœceses*] as it had been dioceſſes, that is, distinct and limited to Presbyters, as dioceſſes were to *Bishops*; and the use of parishes which he subjoynes, cleares the businesse; for he appointed them onely *propter baptismum, & pœnitentiam multorum & sepulturas, for baptisme, and penance, and buriall*; for as yet there was no preaching in Parishes, but in the Mother-Church. Thus it was in the West.

* But in *Ægypt* we find Parishes divided something sooner then the earliest of these, for *Eusebius* reports out of *Philo* that the Christians in S. *Markes* time had severall Churches in *Alexandria. Etiàm* De Ecclesiis *quæ apud eos sunt, ita dicit. Est autem in singulis locis consecrata orationi domus* &c: But even before this, there were *Bishops*. For in Rome there were *fowre Bishops* before any division of Parishes, though S. *Peter* be reckon'd for none. And before Parishes were divided in *Alexandria*, S. *Marke* himselfe who did it was the *Bishop*, and before that time S. *Iames* was *Bishop of Ierusalem*, and *Lib. 2. hist. cap. 17.*

in diverse other places where *Bishops* were, there were no distinct Parishes of a while after *Evaristus* time, for when *Dionysius* had assign'd Presbyters to severall Parishes, he writes of it to *Severus* Bishop of *Corduba*, & desires him to doe so too in his Diocesse, as appeares in his Epistle to him.

apud Binium. tom. 1. Concil

* Euseb. lib. 6. cap. 43.

Apolog. c. 37.

* For indeed necessity requir'd it, when the Christians multiplyed and grew to be μέγιστον καὶ ἀναριθμητον λαὸν, as * *Cornelius* call'd the Roman Christians, a great and innumerable people; and did *implere omnia*, as *Tertullians* phrase is, *fill'd all places*, and publike and great assemblies drew danger upon themselves, and increased jealousies in others, and their publike offices could not be perform'd with so diffused and particular advantage, then they were forc'd to divide congregations, and assigne severall Presbyters to their cure, in subordination to the *Bishop*, and sowe see, the elder Christianity grew, the more Parishes there were. At first in Rome there were none, *Evaristus* made seven, *Dionysius* made some more, and *Marcellus* added 25, and in *Optatus* time there were 40.

lib. 2. contr. Parmenian.

Well then! The case is thus. Parishes were not divided at first, therefore to be sure they were not of Divine institution. Therefore it is no divine institution that a Presbyter should be fixt upon a Parish, therefore also a Parish is not by Christs ordinance an independant body, for by Christs ordinance there was no such thing at all, neither absolute, nor in dependance neither; and then for the maine issue, since *Bishops* were before *Parishes* (in the present sense) the

the *Bishops* in that sense could not be Parochiall.

* But which was first, a private congregation, or a Dioceſſe? If a private congregation, then a *Bishop* was at first fix't in a private congregation, and so was a Parochiall *Bishop*. If a *Dioceſſe* was first, then the Question will be, how a Dioceſſe could be without Pariſhes, for what is a Dioceſſe but a juriſdiction over many Pariſhes?

* I answer, it is true that DIOCESSE and PARISH are words us'd now in contradiſtinction; And now, a Dioceſſe is nothing but the multiplication of of many Pariſhes: *Sed non fuit ſic ab initio.* For at first, a *Dioceſſe was the Citie and the Regio ſuburbicaria*, the neighbouring townes, in which there was no diſtinction of Pariſhes: That which was a Dioceſſe in the ſecular ſenſe, that is, a particular Province, or diviſion of ſecular prefecture, that was the aſſignation of a *Biſhops* charge. * *Epheſus, Smyrna, Pergamus, Laodicea*, were κεφαλαὶ διοικήσεων, *heads of the Dioceſſes*, (ſaith *Pliny*,) meaning in reſpect of ſecular juriſdiction; and ſo they were in Eccleſiaſticall regiment. And it was ſo upon great reaſon, for when the regiment of the Church was extended juſt ſo as the regiment of the Common-wealth, it was of leſſe ſuſpition to the ſecular power, while the Church regiment was juſt fixt together with the politicall, as if of purpoſe to ſhew their mutuall conſiſtence, and it's owne ſubordination. ** And beſides this, there was in it a neceſſity; for the ſubjects of another Province, or Dioceſſe, could not either ſafely, or conveniently meete where the duty of the

lib. 5. cap. 29. & 30. Vide Baron. A. D. 39. n. 10. & B. Rhenan. in notit. provinc. Imperial. in deſcript. Illyrici.

Common-wealth did not ingage them; but being all of one prefecture, and Dioceſſe, the neceſſity of publike meetings in order to the Common-wealth would be faire opportunity for the advancement of their Chriſtendome. And this, which at firſt was a neceſſity in this caſe, grew to be a law in all, by the ſanction of the Councell of * *Chalcedon*, and of *Conſtantinople* in † *Trullo*, τοῖς πολιτικοῖς, καὶ δημοσίοις τύποις καὶ τῆς Ἐκκλησιαστικῶν πραγμάτων ἡ τάξις ἀκολουθείτω. *Let the order of the Church, follow the order and guiſe of the Common-wealth, viz.* in her regiment, and prefefecture.

* *Can.* 17.
† *Can.* 38.

* But in the moderne ſenſe of this diviſion a Biſhops charge was neither a *Pariſh*, nor a *Dioceſſe*, as they are taken in relation; but a Biſhop had the ſupreme care of all the Chriſtians which he by himſelfe, or his Presbyters had converted, and he alſo had the charge of indeavouring the converſion of all the Country. So that although he had not all the Dioceſſe actually in communion and ſubjection, yet his charge, his Dioceſſe was ſo much. Iuſt as it was with the *Apoſtles*, to whom Chriſt gave all the world for a Dioceſſe, yet at firſt they had but a ſmal congregation that did actually obey them.

And now to the Queſtion. Which was firſt, a particular congregation or a Dioceſſe? I anſwere, that a *Dioceſſe* was firſt, that is, the *Apoſtles* had a charge before they had a congregation of converts; And S. *Marke* was ſent *Biſhop* to *Alexandria* by S. *Peter* before any were converted. * But ordinarily the *Apoſtles*, when they had converted a City or Nation,

Nation, then fix't *Bishops* upon their charge, and there indeed the particular congregation was before the *Bishop's* taking of the *Diocesse*; But then, this City, or Nation although it was not the *Bishops Diocesse* before it was a particular congregation, yet it was part of the *Apostles Diocesse*, and this they concredited to the *Bishops* respectively.

S. *Paul* was ordain'd by the Prophets at *Antioch*, *Apostle* of the Uncircumcision; All the Gentiles was his Diocesse, and even of those places he then received power which as yet he had not converted. So that, absolutely, a diocesse was before a particular congregation. But if a *diocesse* be taken collectively, as now it is, for a multitude of *Parishes* united under one *Bishop*, then one must needes be before 20, and a particular congregation before a diocesse; but then that particular congregation was not a parish, in the present sense, for it was not a part of a Diocesse taking a Diocesse for a collection of Parishes; but that particular Congregation was the first fruits of his Diocesse, and like a Graine of Mustard-seed that in time might, and did grow up to a considerable height, even to a necessity of distinguishing titles, and parts of the Diocesse, assigning severall parts, to severall Priests.

2. We see that the Primitive *Bishops*, before the division of parishes, had the City, and Country; and after the division of parishes, had them all under his jurisdiction, and ever, even from the *Apostles* times had severall provinces (some of them I meane) within their limits and charges. * The 35 *Canon* of

the *Apostles* gives power to the Bishop to dispose only of those things ὅσα τῇ ἰδίᾳ παροικίᾳ ὑπάρχει καὶ τοῖς ὑπ' αὐτὸν χώραις, *which are under his Diocesse & the Neighbour-villages*, and the same thing is repeated in the ninth and tenth Canons of the Councell of *Antioch* calling it ἀρχαῖον τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν κανόνα, *the Ancient Canon of our forefathers*; and yet it selfe is elder then three of the generall Councells; and if then it was an Ancient Canon of the Fathers, that the City and Villages should be subject to the Bishop, surely a *Primitive* Bishop was *a Dioceſan.*

Can. 6. But a little before this was the *Nicene Councell*, and there I am sure we have a Bishop that is at least a Dioceſan. τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθη κρατείτω. *Let the old Customes be kept.* What are those? τὰ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ, καὶ Λιβύῃ, καὶ Πενταπόλει. ὥστε καὶ Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐπίσκοπον πάντων τούτων ἔχειν ἐξουσίαν. Let the *Bishop of Alexandria* have power over ALL *Egypt*, *Libya*, and *Pentapolis*: It was a good large Parish; And yet this parish if we have a mind to call it so, was καὶ τὸ ἀρχαῖον ἔθος, *according to the old custome of their forefathers*, and yet that was so early that S. *Anthony* was then alive, who was borne in S. *Irenæus* his time, who was himselfe but second from the *Apostles*.

It was also a good large parish that *Ignatius* was *Bishop* of, even all *Syria*, *Cœlesyria*, *Mesopotamia*, and both the *Ciliciæ*. Ἐπίσκοπος Συρίας, *The Bishop of Syria* he calls himselfe in his epistle to the *Romans*, and

lib. 5. ca. 23. καὶ ἀνατολῶν ἐπισκόπων ἡγούμενος, so *Theodoret*: and besides all these, his Successors, in the Councell of

Action. 7. *Chalcedon*, had the two *Phœniciæ*, and *Arabia* yeilded to

to them by composition. These alone would have made two or three reasonable good parishes, and would have taken up time enough to perambulate, had that been then the guise of Christendome. * But examples of this kind are infinite. *Theodorus Bishop of Cyrus* was Pastor over 800 parishes, *Athanasius* was Bishop of *Alexandria, Egypt, Thebais, Mareotis, Libya, Ammoniaca,* and *Pentapolis,* saith S. *Epiphanius*; And his predecessor *Iulianus,* successor of *Agrippinus,* was Bishop * *of the Churches about Alexandria.* Either it was a Diocesse, or at least a plurality. * † S. *Chrysostome* had *Pontus, Asia,* and all *Thrace* in his parish, even as much as came to sixteen prefectures; a faire bounds surely; and so it was with all the Bishops, a greater, or a lesser Diocesse they had; but all were Diocesan; for they had severall parishes, *singuli Ecclesiarum Episcopi habent sub se Ecclesias,* saith *Epiphanius* in his epistle to *Iohn* of *Ierusalem,* and in his book *contra hæreses, Quotquot enim in Alexandria Catholicæ Ecclesiæ sunt, sub uno Archiepiscopo sunt, privatimq; ad has destinati sunt Presbyteri propter Ecclesiasticas necessitates, ita ut habitatores vicini sint uniuscujusq; Ecclesiæ.* * All *Italy* was the parish of *Liberius* (saith *Socrates.*) *Africa* was S. *Cyprians* parish, saith S. *Gregory Nazianzen,* and S. *Basil* the Great was parish-Priest to all *Cappadocia.* But I rather believe if we examine their severall stories they will rather prove *Metropolitans,* then meere parochians.

Epist. ad Leon. 1. Episc. Rom.

Hæres. 68.

**Concil Chalced. act. 16.*

† Theodoret. lib. 5. c. 28.

Apud S. Hieron. hæres. 69.

Lib. 4. c. 12.

Encom. Cyprian.

Sozom. lib. 5. c. 18.

Vide apud Euseb. lib. 7. c. 22.

3ly The ancient *Canons* forbad a *Bishop* to be ordain'd

dain'd in a Village, Castle, or Towne. It was so decreed in the Councell of *Laodicea* before the first *Nicene*. Can. 56. ὅτι οὐ δεῖ ἐν ταῖς κώμαις ἢ ἐν ταῖς χώραις καθίστασθαι Ἐπισκόπους. In the Villages, or Countries, *Bishops* must not be constituted. And this was renewed in the Councell of *Sardis*, Can. 6. μὴ ἐξεῖναι ἀπλῶς καθίστασθαι ἐπίσκοπον ἐν κώμῃ τινὶ ἢ ἐν ἐσχατιᾷ πόλ[illegible] καὶ εἰς μόνος πρεσβύτερος ἐπαρκεῖ. *It is not lawfull to ordaine Bishops in Villages or little Townes to which one Presbyter is sufficient*, ἀλλ' ... ἐπίσκοποι ἐν ταύταις ἢ πόλεσι καθίστασθαι ὅπου κόμαι ἐφείλκυσαν ἔνθα καὶ φοίτησαν ἱτύγχανον γοῦν τινες ἐπίσκοποι, *but Bishops must ordaine Bishops in those Cities where Bishops formerly have been.* * So that this Canon does not make a new Constitution, but perpetuates the old sanction. Bishops *ab antiquo* were only ordain'd in great Cities, and Presbyters to little Villages. Who then was the Parish Curate? the Bishop or the Priest? The case is too apparent.

Onely, here it is objected that some *Bishops* were of small Townes, and therefore these *Canons* were not observed, and *Bishops* might be, and were parochiall, as S. *Gregory* of *Nazianzum*, *Zoticus* of *Comana*, *Maris* in *Dolicha*. The one of these is called * κώμη by * *Eusebius*; and another πολίχνη by † *Theodoret*, a *little Towne*. This is all is pretended for this great Scarcrow of parochiall Bishops.

* Lib. 5. c. 16.
† Lib. 5. cap. 4.

* But, first, suppose these had been parishes, and these three parochiall Bishops, it followes not that all were; not those to be sure, which I have proved to have been *Bishops* of *Provinces*, and *Kingdomes*. 2ly It is a cleare case, that *Nazianzum* though

though a small City, yet was the seate of a *Bishops throne*, so it is reckoned in the διατύπωσις made by *Leo* the Emperour, where it is accounted *inter thronos Ecclesiarum Patriarchæ Constantinopolitano subjectarum*, & is in the same account with *Cæsarea*, with *Ephesus*, with *Crete*, with *Philippi*, and almost foure-score more. * As for *Zoticus*, he indeed came from *Comana*, a Village towne, for there he was born, but he was *Episcopus Otrenus*, *Bishop of Otrea in Armenia*, saith † *Nicephorus*. * And for *Maris* the *Bishop of Dolicha*, it was indeed such a small Citty as *Nazianzus* was, but that proves not but his Dioceſse and territory was large enough. Thus was *Asclepius vici non grandis*, but yet he was *Vagensis territorii Episcopus*. His seat might usually be in a little Citty, if it was one of those townes in which according to the exigence of the Canons ἔνθα ἡ πρέπειν ἐτύγχανον γεγονότες Ἐπίσκοποι *in which Bishops anciently were ordain'd*, and yet the appurtenances of his Dioceſse large, and extended, and too great for 100 Parish Priests.

Ius Græco-Rom. p. 89.

Vide Baron. An. Dom. 205 n. 27.

† Lib. 4. c. 25.

Gennad. apud Hieron. Iohan. de Tritenheim de script. Eccles.

4ly. The institution of *Chorepiscopi* proves most evidently that the Primitive Bishops were Dioceſan, not Parochiall: for they were instituted to assist the Bishop in part of his Country-charge, and were περιοδευταί, *Visiters*, (as the Councell of *Laodicea* calls them.) But what need such Suffragans, such coadjutors to the managing of a *Parish*. Indeed they might possibly have been needfull for the managing of a Citty-parish, especially if a whole Citty was a Parish, as these objectors must pretend, or not say

Primitive Bishops were Parochiall. But being these *Chorepiscopi* were *Suffragans* to the Bishop, and did their offices in the country, while the Bishop was resident in the Citty, either the Bishops parish extended it selfe from Citty to Country; and then it is all one with a *Dioceße*, or else we can find no imployment for a *Chorepiscopus*, or Visiter. * The tenth Canon of the Councell of *Antioch*, describes their use and power. *Qui in villis & vicis constituti sunt Chorepiscopi .... placuit sanctæ Synodo ut modum proprium recognoscant, ut gubernent sibi subjectas Ecclesias.* They were to governe *the Churches* delegated to their charge. It seems they had many Churches under their provision, and yet they were but the Bishops Vicars, for so it follows in the *Canon*; he must not ordaine any Presbyters, and Deacons *absq; urbis Episcopo cui ipse subjicitur, & Regio*; Without leave of the Bishop of the Citty to whom both himselfe, and all the Country is subordinate.

5. The Bishop was one in a Citty wherein were many Presbyters. ἓν θυσιαστήριον πάσῃ τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ καὶ εἷς ἐπίσκοπος ἅμα τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ καὶ διακόνοις, saith S. *Ignatius*. *There is one Altar in every Church, and* ONE BISHOP *together with the Presbytery, and the Deacons.* Either then a whole City, such as *Rome*, or *Ierusalem* (which as *Iosephus* reports had 400 Synagogues,) must be but one Parish, and then they had as good call a *Bishops* charge a *Dioceße*, as a *Parish* in that latitude; or if there were many Parishes in a Citty, and the Bishop could have but one

Epist. ad Philadelph.

of

of them, why, what hindred but that there might in a Citty be as many Bishops, as Presbyters? For if a Bishop can have but one Parish, why may not every Parish have a Bishop? But by the ancient *Canons*, a City though never so great, could have but one for it selfe and all the Country, therefore every parish-Priest was not a Bishop, nor the Bishop a meere parish-Priest.

Ne in unâ civitate duo sint Episcopi, was the Constitution of the *Nicene* Fathers as saith *Ruffinus*; and long before this, it was so known a businesse that one City should have but one Bishop, that *Cornelius* exprobrates to *Novatus* his ignorance, *is ergo qui Evangelium vendicabat, nesciebat in Ecclesiâ Catholicâ unum Episcopum esse debere, ubi videbat esse Presbyteros quadraginta & sex. Novatus* (the Father of the old Puritans) *was a goodly Gospeller that did not know that in a Catholick Church there should be but one Bishop wherein there were* 46 *Presbyters*; intimating clearely that a Church that had two *Bishops* is not Catholick, but Schismatick at least, (if both be pretended to be of a fixt residence) what then is he that would make as many *Bishops* in a Church as Presbyters? He is πόλεμος, he fights against God, if S. *Ambrose* say true. *Deus enim singulis Ecclesiis singulos Episcopos præesse decrevit. God hath decreed that one Bishop should rule in one Church*; and of what extent his ONE CHURCH was, may easily be guessed by himselfe who was the Ruler, and Bishop of the great City, and province of *Millaine*. * And therefore when *Valerius*

Lib. 10. *Eccles. hist.*

Apud Eusch. lib. 6. *cap.* 33.

In 1. *Cor.* 12.

* ὡς καὶ ἄλλαι πόλεις. *Epiphan. hæres. 66. n. 6. Possidon. in vitâ S. Aug. cap. 8.* * as it was then sometimes used in severall Churches had ordain'd S. *Austin* to be Bishop of *Hippo*, whereof *Valerius* was also Bishop at the same time, S. *Austin* was troubled at it as an act most Uncanonicall, and yet he was not ordain'd to rule in common with *Valerius*, but to rule in succession and after the consummation of *Valerius*. It was the same case in *Agelius*, a *Novatian* Bishop ordaining *Marcian* to be his successor, and *Sisinnius* to succeed him, the acts were indeed irregular, but yet there was no harme in it to this cause, they were ordain'd to succeed, not in conjunction. * Δι' ὁμοίας συμβολὴν καὶ Ἐκκλησιαστικῆς θεσμῶν ἀλόγιστον, (saith *Sozomen*) It is a note of Schisme, and against the rule of H. Church to have two Bishops in one chaire. *Secundus Episcopus nullus est* (saith S. † *Cyprian*) And as *Cornelius* reports it in his epistle to S. *Cyprian*, it was the voice of the Confessors that had been the instruments and occasions of the *Novatian Schisme* by erecting another Bishop; *Nec non & ignoramus unum Deum esse, unum Christum esse Dominum quem confessi sumus, unum spiritum sanctum, unum Episcopum in Catholicâ Ecclesiâ esse debere*. And these very words the people also used in the contestation about *Liberius*, and *Fælix*. For when the Emperour was willing that *Liberius* should returne to his See, on condition that *Fælix* the Arian might be Bishop there too, they derided the suggestion, crying out, *One God, one Christ, one Bishop*. So *Theodoret* reports. But who lists to see more of this, may be satisfied (if plenty will doe it) in S. *Chrysostome*, *Theodo-*

Socrat. lib. 5. cap. 21.

Lib. 4. cap. 15.

† *Lib. 4. Epist. 2.*

Lib. 2. c. 11.

a *In 1. Philip.*

[b] *Theodoret*, S. [c] *Hierom*, [d] *Oecumenius*, [e] *Optatus*, S. [f] *Ambrose*, and if he please he may read a whole booke of it written by S. *Cyprian*, *de Vnitate Ecclesiæ, sive de singularitate Prelatorum.*

[b] [c] [d] *in* 1. Philip.
[e] *lib.* 2. *contr. Parmen.*
[f] *in* 1. *Tim.* 3. *& in* 1. *Phil.*

6ly. Suppose the ordinary *Dioceſſes* had been *pariſhes*, yet what were the *Metropolitans*, and the *Primates*, were they alſo *pariſh-Biſhops*? Surely if *Biſhops* were *parochiall*, then theſe were at leaſt *dioceſan* by their owne argument, for to be ſure they had many *Biſhops* under them. But there were none ſuch in the Primitive Church? yes moſt certainly. The 35 *Canon of the Apoſtles* tells us ſo, moſt plainely, and at the worſt, they were a very primitive record. *Epiſcopos gentium ſingularum ſcire convenit quis inter eos* PRIMUS HABEATUR, *quem velut caput exiſtiment, & nihil amplius præter ejus conſcientiam gerant, quàm ea ſola quæ parochiæ propriæ, & villis quæ ſub eâ ſunt, competunt. The Biſhops of every Nation muſt know who is their* PRIMATE, *and eſteeme him as their* HEAD, *and doe* NOTHING *without his conſent, but thoſe things that appertaine to their owne Dioceſſe.* And from hence the Fathers of the Councell of *Antioch* deriv'd their ſanction, *per ſingulas regiones Epiſcopos convenit noſſe* METROPOLITANUM *Epiſcopum ſollicitudinem totius provinciæ gerere* &c. *The Biſhops of every province muſt know that their* METROPOLITAN-*Biſhop does take cure of all the province.* For this was an Apoſtolicall Conſtitution (ſaith S. *Clement*) that in the converſion of Gentile Cities in place of the *Archflamines*, *Archbiſhops*, *Primates*, or *Patriarchs* ſhould be placed, *qui reli-*

Concil. Antioch. ca. 9.

Epiſt. 1. *ad Iacobum Fratrem Domini.*

quorum Episcoporum judicia, & manera (quoties necesse foret) negotia in fide agitarent, & secundùm Dei voluntatem, sicut constituerunt Sancti Apostoli, definirent. * *Alexandria* was a *Metropoliticall See* long before the *Nicene* Councell, as appeares in the sixth *Canon* before cited; Nay, *Dioscorus* the *Bishop* of that Church was required to bring ten of the METROPOLITANS that he had UNDER HIM to the Councell of *Ephesus*, by *Theodosius* and *Valentinian* Emperours, so that it was a PATRIARCHAT.

vide Concil. Chalced. act. 1. in epist. Theod. & Valentin. Imp.

These are enough to shew that in the Primitive Church there were *Metropolitan Bishops*. Now then either *Bishops* were *Parochiall*, or no: If no, then they were *Diocesan*; if yea, then at least many of them were *Diocesan*, for they had (according to this rate) many *Parochiall Bishops* under them. * But I have stood too long upon this impertinent trifle, but as now adayes it is made, the consideration of it is materiall to the maine Question. Only this I adde; That if any man should trouble the world with any other fancy of his owne, and say that our *Bishops* are nothing like the Primitive, because all the *Bishops* of the Primitive Church had onely two townes in their charge, and no more, and each of these townes had in them 1170 families, and were bound to have no more, how should this man be confuted? It was just such a device as this in them that first meant to disturbe this Question, by pretending that the *Bishops* were onely *parochiall*, not *diocesan*, and that there was no other *Bishop* but the *Parish-Priest*. Most certainly, themselves could

no

not beleive the allegation, onely they knew it would raise a dust. But by God's providence, there is water enough in the Primitive fountaines to allay it.

§. 44. And was ayded by Presbyters but not impayred.

ANother consideration must here be interpos'd concerning the intervening of Presbyters in the regiment of the severall Churches. For though I have twice already showne that they could not challenge it of right either by Divine institution, or *Apostolicall* ordinance, yet here also it must be considered how it was in the practice of the Primitive Church, for those men that call the *Bishop* a Pope, are themselves desirous to make a Conclave of Cardinalls too, & to make every Dioceſſe a Romane Consistory.

1. Then, the first thing we heare of Presbyters (after Scripture I meane, for of it I have already given account) is from the testimony of S. *Hierome*, *Antequam studia in religione fierent, & diceretur in populis ego sum Pauli &c: communi Presbyterorum consilio Ecclesiæ gubernabantur. Before factions arose in the Church, the Church was govern'd by the common Counsell of Presbyters.* Here S. *Hierome* either meanes it of the time before Bishops were constituted in particular Churches, or after Bishops were appointed. If, *before Bishops were appointed*, no hurt done, the Presbyters might well rule in common, before themselves had a ruler appointed to governe both them and all the dioceſſe beside. For so S. *Ignatius* writing to the Church of *Antioch* exhorts

in Epist. ad Titum. cap. 1.

Epist. ad Antioch.

exhorts the *Presbyters* to feed the flock untill God should declare τὸν μέλλοντα ἄρχειν ὑμῶν *whom he would make their ruler.* And S. *Cyprian* speaking of *Epist. 21.* *Etecusa* and some other women that had made defailance in time of persecution, and so were put to penance, *præceperunt Præpositi tantisper sic esse, donec Episcopus constituatur.* The *Presbyters*, whom *sede vacante* hee *præterea Clerum suum* calls *Præpositos*, they gave order that they should so remaine till the Consecration of a *Bishop.* * But, if S. *Hierome* meanes this saying of his, *after Bishops were fixt*, then his expression answers the allegation, for it was but *communi* CONSILIO *Presbyterorum*, the IUDICIUM might be solely in the *Bishop*, he was the IUDGE, though the *Presbyters* were the COUNSELLORS. For so himselfe addes, that upon occasion of those first Schismes in *Corinth*, it was DECREED *in* ALL THE WORLD, *vt omnis Ecclesiæ cura ad unum pertineret*, all the care of the *diocesse* was in the *Bishop*, and therefore all the *power* for it was unimaginable that the burden should be laid on the *Bishop*, and the *strength* put into the hands of the *Presbyters.* * And so S. *Ignatius* stiles them, [σύμβουλοι, καὶ συνεδρευταὶ τοῦ Ἐπισκόπου,] *Assessors, and Counsellors to the Bishop.* But yet if we take our estimate from *Ignatius*, *The* Bishop is THE RULER, *without him though all concurr'd, yet nothing could be done, nothing attempted; The Bishop was Superiour in* ALL POWER *and* AUTHORITY, *He was to be obey'd in* ALL THINGS, *and contradicted in* NOTHING; *The Bishops judgement was to sway, and nothing must seem pleasing*

Ad Trallian. *Ad Magnes.*

pleasing to the Presbyters that was crosse to the Bishops sentence: this, and a great deale more which I have formerly made use of, is in *Ignatius*; And now let their assistance and Counsell extend as farre as it will, the *Bishops* authority is invulnerable. But I have already enough discussed this instance of S. *Hierome's*. §. thither I referre the Reader.

2. But S. *Cyprian* must doe this businesse for us, if any man, for of all the *Bishops*, he did acts of the greatest condescension, and seeming declination of Episcopall authority. But let us see the worst. *Ad id verò quod scripserunt mihi compresbyteri nostri .... solus rescribere nihil potui, quando à primordio Episcopatûs mei statuerim nihil sine consilio vestro, & sine consensu plebis meæ privatâ sententiâ gerere.* And againe, *quamvis mihi videantur debere pacem accipere, tamen ad consultum vestrum eos dimisi, ne videar aliquid temerè præsumere.* And a third time, *Quæ res cùm omnium nostrum consilium & sententiam spectet, præjudicare ego & soli mihi rem communem vindicare non audeo.* These are the greatest steps of Episcopall humility that I find *in materiâ juridicâ*, The summe whereof is this, that S. *Cyprian* did consult his Presbyters and Clergy in matters of consequence, and resolved to *doe nothing*, without their *advice*. But then, consider also, it was, *statui apud me*, *I have resolved with my selfe* to doe nothing without your *Counsell*. It was no *necessity ab extrà*, *no duty*, no *Sanction of holy Church* that bound him to such a modesty, it was his owne voluntary act. 2. It was as well *Diaconorum*,

Epist. 6.

Epist. 19.

Epist. 18.

rum, as *Presbyterorum consilium* that he would have in conjunction, as appeares by the titles of the *sixth and eighteenth Epistles*; *Cyprianus Presbyteris, ac* DIACONIS *fratribus salutem*: So that here the *Presbyters* can no more challenge a power of regiment in common, then the *Deacons*, by any *Divine law, or Catholike practice.* 3. S. *Cyprian* also would actually have the consent of the *people too*, and that will as well disturbe the *Ius Divinum* of an *independant Presbytery*, as of an *independant Episcopacy*.

But indeed neither of them both need to be much troubled, for all this was voluntary in S. *Cyprian*, like *Moses*, *qui cùm in potestate suâ habuit vt solus posset præesse populo, seniores elegit* (to use S. *Hierome's* expression) *who when it was in his power alone to rule the people, yet chose seaventy Elders for assistants.* For as for S. *Cyprian* this very Epistle cleares it that no part of his *Episcopall authority* was impayred. For he shewes what himselfe alone could doe. *Fretus igitur dilectione vestrâ, & religione, quam satis novi, his literis & hortor & mando &c. I intreat and* COMMAND *you.... vice meâ fungamini circa gerenda ea quæ administratio religiosa deposcit, Be my substitutes in the administration of Church affayres.* He intreates them *pro dilectione*, because they lov'd him, he COMMANDS THEM PRO RELIGIONE, *by their religion*; for it was a peice of their religion to obey him, and in him was the governement of his Church, else how could he have put the Presbyters, and Deacons in substitution?

in 1. ad Titum.

* Add:

* Adde to this; It was the custome of the Church that although the *Bishop* did onely impose hands in the ordination of Clerks, yet the Clergy did approve, & examine the persons to be ordain'd, and it being a thing of publike interest, it was then not thought fit to be a personall action both in preparation, and ministration too (and for this S. *Chrysostome* was accus'd *in Concilio nefario* [as the title of the edition of it, expresses it] that he made ordinations ἀνὰ σωφρόνων καὶ παρὰ γνώμην τῶν κλήρων) yet when S. *Cyprian* saw occasion for it, he did *ordaine without the consent of the Clergy of his Church*, for so he ordained *Celerinus*, so he ordain'd *Optatus*, and *Saturus*, when himselfe was from his Church, and in great want of Clergy-men to assist in the ministration of the daily offices. *** He did as much in *jurisdiction too*, and *censures*; for HIMSELFE did *excommunicate Felicissimus and Augendus, and Repostus, and Irene, and Paula*, as appeares in his 38, and 39 epistles; and tells * *Rogatianus* that he might have done as much to the *petulant Deacon* that abus'd him by vertue of his Episcopall authority. And the same power singly, and solely, he exercis'd in his acts of favour and absolution; *Vnus atq; alius* OBNITENTE PLEBE ET CONTRADICENTE, MEA *tamen* FACILITATE *suscepti sunt*. Indeed here is no contradiction of the Clergy expressed, but yet the absolution said to be his owne act, against the people and without the Clergy. For he alone was the IUDGE, insomuch that he declared that it was the cause of Schisme and heresie that the *Bishop* was not

Ius Græco Rom. pag. 556.

* *Epist.* 65.

Epist. 55.

ibidem. obey'd, *nec* UNUS *in Ecclesiâ ad tempus Sacerdos, & ad tempus* IUDEX VICE CHRISTI COGITATUR, *and that* ONE *high Priest in a Church, and* IUDGE INSTEED OF CHRIST *is not admitted.* So that the *Bishop* must be ONE, and that ONE must be IUDGE, and to acknowledge more, in S. *Cyprians* Lexicon is called schisme and heresie. Farther yet, this *Iudicatory* of the *Bishop* is *independant*, and responsive to *Epist. 52.* *none* but *Christ*. *Actum suum disponit, & dirigit* *Epist. 72.* *Vnusquisq; Episcopus rationem propositi sui Domino redditurus*, and againe, *habet in Ecclesiæ administratione voluntatis suæ arbitrium liberum, unusquisq; Praepositus: rationem actûs sui Domino redditurus. The Bishop is Lord of his owne actions, and may doe what seemes good in his owne eyes, and for his actions he is to account to Christ.*

This generall account is sufficient to satisfie the allegations out of the 6th, and 18th epistles, and indeed, the whole Question. But for the 18th epistle, there is something of peculiar answer. For first, It was a case of publike concernement, and therefore he would so comply with the publike interest as to doe it by publike counsell. 2ly, It was a necessity of times that made this case peculiar. NECESSITAS TEMPORUM *facit ut non temerè pacem demus*, they are the first words of the next epistle, which is of the same matter; for if the *lapsi* had been easily, and without a publike and solemne triall reconcil'd, it would have made Gentile Sacrifices frequent, and Martyrdome but seldome. 3ly, The common counsell which S. *Cyprian* here said he would expect,

was

was the Councell of the Confessors, to whom for a peculiar honour it was indulged that they should be interested in the publike assoyling of such penitents who were overcome with those feares which the Confessors had overcome. So that this is evidently an act of positive, and temporary discipline; and as it is no disadvantage to the power of the *Bishop*, so to be sure, no advantage to the *Presbyter*. * But the clause of objection from the 19th *epistle* is yet unanswer'd, and that runs something higher, ... *tamen ad consultum vestrum eos dimisi ne videar aliquid temerè præsumere.* It is called presumption to reconcile the penitents without the advice of those to whom he writ. But from this we are fairely deliver'd by the title. *Cypriano, & Compresbyteris Carthagini consistentibus; Caldonius, salutem.* It was not the epistle of *Cyprian* to his Presbyters, but of *Caldonius* one of the *suffragan* Bishops *of Numidia* to his *Metropolitan*; and now, what wonder if he call it presumption to doe an act of so publike consequence without the advise of his *Metropolitan*. He was bound to consult him by the *Canons Apostolicall*, and so he did, and no harme done to the present Question, of the Bishops *sole* and *independant power*, and unmixt with the conjunct interest of the *Presbytery*, who had nothing to doe beyond *ministery*, *counsell*, and *assistance*.

3. In all Churches where a Bishops seat was, there were not alwayes a Colledge of Presbyters, but only in the greatest Churches; for sometimes in the lesser Cities there were but two. *Esse oportet,*

& aliquantos Presbyteros, ut bini sint per Ecclesias,
In 1. Timoth. 3. *& unus in civitate Episcopus.* So S *Ambrose*, *some-times there was but one in a Church.* *Posthumianus* in the third Councell of *Carthage* put the case. *Deinde qui unum* [*Presbyterum*] *habuerit, numquid debet illi ipse unus Presbyter auferri?* The Church of *Hippo* had but one. *Valerius* was the Bishop, and *Austin* was the Priest; and after him *Austin* was the Bishop, & *Eradius* the Priest. Sometimes not one, as in the case *Aurelius* put in the same Councell I now cited, of a Church that had never a Presbyter to be consecrated *Bishop* in the place of him that dyed; & once at *Hippo* they had none, even then when the people snatch'd S. *Austin* and carried him to *Valerius* to be ordain'd. In these cases I hope it will not be denied but the Bishop was *Judge alone*, I am sure he had but little company, sometimes none at all.

4. But suppose it had been alwaies done that Presbyters were consulted in matters of great difficulty, and possibility of Scandal, for so S. *Ambrose* 1. Tim. 1. intimates, *Ecclesia seniores habuit sine quorum Consilio nihil gerebatur in Ecclesiâ* (understand, in these Churches where Presbyteries were fixt) yet this might be necessary, and was so indeed in some degree at first, which in succession as it prov'd troublesome to the Presbyters; so unnecessary and impertinent to the *Bishops*. At first I say it might be necessary. For they were times of persecution, and temptation, and if both the Clergy and people too were not comply'd withall in such exigence of time, and agonies of spirit, it was the way to make them

them relapse to Gentilisme; for a discontented spirit will hide it selfe, and take sanctuary in the reedes and mud of *Nilus*, rather then not take complacence in an imaginary security and revenge. 2. As yet there had been scarse any *Synods* to determine cases of publike difficulty, and what they could not receive from publike decision, it was fitting they should supply by the maturity of a Consiliary assistance, and deliberation. For although, by the *Canons* of the *Apostles*, *Bishops* were bound twise a yeare to celebrate *Synods*, yet persecution intervening, they were rather twice a yeare a διασπορὰ then σύνοδος, *a dispersion then a Synod.* 3. Although *Synods* had been as frequently conven'd as was intended by the Apostles, yet it must be length of time, and a successive experience that must give opportunity and ability to give generall rules for the emergency of all particulars, and therefore till the Church grew of some considerable age, a fixt standing Colledge of Presbyters was more requisite then since it hath been, when the frequency of Generall Councells, and Provinciall Synods, and the peace of the Church, and the innumerable volumes of the Fathers, and Decretalls of Bishops, and a digest of Ecclesiasticall Constitutions, hath made the personall assistance of Presbyters unnecessary. 4. When necessity requir'd not their presence and Counsell, their own necessity requir'd that they should attend their severall cures. For let it be considered; they that would now have a Colledge of Presbyters assist the Bishop whether they think of what follo-

lowes.

lowes. For either they must have Presbyters ordain'd without a title, which I am sure they have complain'd of these threescore years, or else they must be forc'd to *Non-residence*. For how else can they assist the Bishop in the ordinary, and daily occurrences of the Church, unless either they have no cure of their own, or else neglect it? And as for the extraordinary, either the Bishop is to consult his *Metropolitan*, or he may be assisted by a *Synod*, if the *Canons* already constitute doe not aide him, but in all these cases the *Presbytery* is impertinent.

5. As this assistance of Presbyters was at first for necessity, and after by Custome it grew a Law; so now *retrò*, first the necessity fail'd, and then the desuetude abrogated the *Law*, which before, custome had establish'd. [*quod quâ negligentiâ obsoleverit nescio*] saith S. *Ambrose*, he knew not how it came to be obsolete, but so it was, it had expired before his time. Not but that Presbyters were still in Mother-Churches (I meane in Great ones) *In Ecclesiâ enim habemus Senatum nostrum, actum Presbyterorum, we have still* (saith S. *Hierome*) *in the Church our Senate, a Colledge, or Chapter of Presbyters*, (he was then at *Rome*, or *Jerusalem*) but they were not consulted in Church affaires, & matter of jurisdiction, that was it, that S. *Ambrose* wondred how it came to passe. And thus it is to this day. In our Mother Churches we have a Chapter too, but the Bishop consults them not in matters of ordinary jurisdiction, just so it was in S. *Ambrose* his time, and therefore our Bishops have altered no custome in this

Vbi suprà.

In Isaiæ c. 3.

this particular, the alteration was pregnant even before the end of the fowre generall Councells, and therefore is no violation of a *divine right*, for then most certainly a contrary provision would have been made in those conventions, wherein so much sanctity, and authority, and Catholicisme and severe discipline were conjunct; and then besides, it is no innovation in practice which pretends so faire antiquity, but however it was never otherwise then voluntary in the Bishops, and positive discipline in the Church, and conveniency in the thing for that present, and Councell in the Presbyters, and a trouble to the Presbyters persons, and a disturbance of their duties when they came to be fixt upon a particular charge.

* One thing more before I leave. I find a *Canon* of the Councell of *Hispalis* objected. *Episcopus Presbyteris solus honorem dare potest, solus autem auferre non potest. A Bishop may alone ordaine a Priest, a Bishop may not alone depose a Priest.* Therefore in censures there was in the Primitive Church a necessity of conjunction of Presbyters with the Bishop in imposition of *censures*. Can. 6.

* To this I answer, first it is evident, that hee that can give an honour, can also take it away, if any body can; for there is in the nature of the thing no greater difficulty in pulling downe, then in raising up. It was wont alwaies to be accounted easier; therefore this Canon requiring a conjunct power in deposing Presbyters is a positive constitution of the Church, founded indeed upon good institution,

but built upon no deeper foundation, neither of nature or higher institution, then its own present authority.

But that's enough, for we are not now in question of *divine right*, but of *Catholick and Primitive practice*. To it therefore I answer, that the conjunct hand required to pull downe a Presbyter, was not the Chapter, or Colledge of Presbyters; but a company of Bishops, a *Synodall sentence*, and *determination*, for so the *Canon* runnes, *qui profecto nec ab uno damnari, nec uno judicante poterunt honoris sui privilegiis exui: sed præsentati* SYNODALI IUDICIO, *quod canon de illis præceperit definiri.* And the same thing was determin'd in the Greekes *Councell of Carthage*. If a Presbyter or a Deacon be accused, their owne Bishop shall *judge* them, not *alone*, but with the assistance of *sixe Bishops* more, in the case of a Presbyter; three, of a Deacon; ἀλλ' ἢ λοιπῶν κληρικῶν τὰς αἰτίας ἡ μόνος ὁ ἐπίσκοπος διαγνῶ ἢ μετὰ τρίτου. But the causes of the other Clergy the Bishop of the place must ALONE *heare and determine them*. So that by this *Canon*, in some things the Bishop might not be *alone*, but then his *assistants* were *Bishops*, not *Presbyters*, in other things he *alone was judge* without either, and yet his sentences must not be *clancular*, but in *open Court*, in the full Chapter; for his Presbyters must be present and so it is determin'd for *Africa* in the *fourth Councell of Carthage*, *Vt Episcopus nullius causam audiat absq; præsentiâ Clericorum suorum: alioquin irrita erit sententia Episcopi nisi præsentiâ Clericorum confirmetur.* Here

Can. 20.

Can. 23.

is

is indeed a necessity of the presence of the Clergy of his Church where his Consistory was kept, least the sentence should be *clandestine*, and so *illegall*, but it is nothing but *præsentia Clericorum*, for it is *sententia Episcopi, the Bishops sentence*, and the *Clerks presence only*; for μόνος ὁ ἐντόπος ἐπίσκοπος, *the Bishop* ALONE *might give sentence* in the causes of the inferior Clergy, even by this Canon it selfe, which is used for objection against the *Bishops sole jurisdiction*.

*** I know nothing now to hinder our processe; for the Bishops jurisdiction is clearely left in his own hand, and the Presbyters had no share in it, but by delegation and voluntary assumption. Now I proceed in the maine question.

§ 45.

So that the government of the Church by Bishops was believed necessary.

WEE have seen what *Episcopacy* is in it selfe, now from the same principles let us see what it is to us. And first; Antiquity taught us it was *simply necessary*, even to the *being* and *constitution of a Church*. That runs high, but we must follow our leaders. * S. *Ignatius* is expresse in this question. *Qui intra altare est, mundus est, quare & obtemperat Episcopo, & Sacerdotibus. Qui verò foris est hic is est, qui sine Episcopo, Sacerdote, & Diacono quicquam agit, & ejusmodi inquinatam habet conscientiam, & infideli deterior est. He that is within the Altar, that is, within the Communion of the Church, he is pure, for he obeyes the Bishop, and the Priests. But he that is without, that is, does any thing without his Bishop and the Clergy, he hath a filthy con-*

Epist. ad Tral.

science and is worse then an infidell. NECESSE *itaq;* *est, quicquid facitis, ut* SINE EPISCOPO NIHIL *faciatis. It is* NECESSARY *that whatsoever ye doe, ye be sure to doe nothing without the Bishop. Quid enim aliud est Episcopus, &c. For what else is a Bishop but he that is greater then all power?* So that the obeying the Bishop is the necessary condition of a Christian, and Catholick communion; he that does not, is worse then an infidell. The same also he affirmes a-

Epist. ad Philadelph. gaine. *Quotquot enim Christi sunt partium Episcopi, qui verò ab illo declinant, & cum maledictis communionem amplectuntur, hi cum illis excidentur. All them that are on Christs side, are on the Bishops side, but they that communicate with accursed Schismaticks, shall be cutt off with them.* * If then we will be Christ's servants, we must be obedient and subordinate to the Bishop. It is the condition of Christianity. We are not Christians else. So is the intimation of S. *Ignatius.* * As full and pertinent is the peremptory resolution of S. *Cyprian* in that admi-

Epist. 27. & alibi. rable epistle of his *ad Lapsos*, where after he had spoken how Christ instituted the *honour of Episcopacy* in concrediting the Keyes to *Peter* and the other Apostles, *Inde* (saith he) *per temporum & successionum vices, Episcoporum ordinatio, &* ECCLESIÆ RATIO *decurrit,* VT ECCLESIA SUPER EPISCOPOS CONSTITUATUR, *& omnis actus Ecclesiæ per* EOSDEM PRÆPOSITOS *gubernetur. Hence is it, that by severall succcession of Bishops the Church is continued, so that the* CHURCH HATH IT'S BEING, OR CONSTITUTION BY BISHOPS, *and every act of*

of Eccleſiaſticall regiment is to be diſpoſed by them. Cùm hoc itaq; divinâ lege fundatum ſit, miror &c. Since therefore this is ſo ESTABLISHED BY THE LAW OF GOD, *I wonder any man ſhould queſtion it, &c.* And therefore as in all buildings, the foundation being gone, the fabrick falls, ſo IF YE TAKE AWAY BISHOPS, *the Church muſt aske a writing of divorce from God, for it can no longer bee called a Church.* This account we have from S. *Cyprian*, and he reenforces againe upon the ſame charge in his *Epiſtle *ad Florentium Papianum*, where he makes a Biſhop to be ingredient into the DEFINITION *of a Church.* [*Eccleſia eſt plebs ſacerdoti adunata, & Paſtori ſuo Grex adhærens, The Church is a flock adhering to it's Paſtor, and a people united to their Biſhop*] for that ſo he means by *Sacerdos*, appears in the words ſubjoyn'd, *Vnde & ſcire debes Epiſcopum in Eccleſiâ eſſe, & Eccleſiam in Epiſcopo, & ſi qui* Cum EPISCOPO NON SIT IN ECCLESIA NON ESSE, *& fruſtrà ſibi blandiri eos qui pacem cum Sacerdotibus Dei non habentes obrepunt, & latenter apud quoſdam communicare ſe credunt &c. As a Biſhop is in the Church, ſo the Church is in the Biſhop, and he that does not communicate with the Biſhop is not in the Church*; and therefore they vainely flatter themſelves that think their caſe faire and good, if they communicate in conventicles, and forſake their Biſhop. *Epiſt. 69.

And for this cauſe the holy Primitives were ſo confident, and zealous for a *Biſhop*, that they would rather expoſe themſelves and all their tribes to a

vide Concil. Byzacenum. An. Dom. 504. & Surium die 1. Ianuar. & Baron. in A. D. 504.

persecution, then to the greater misery, the want of *Bishops*. *Fulgentius* tells an excellent story to this purpose. When *Frasamund* King of *Byzac* in *Africa* had made an edict that no more *Bishops* should be consecrate; to this purpose that the Catholike faith might expire (so he was sure it would, if this device were perfected) *vt arescentibus truncis absq; palmitibus omnes Ecclesiæ desolarentur*, the good *Bishops* of the Province met together in a *Councell*, and having considered of the command of the tyrant, *Sacra turba Pontificum qui remanserant communicato inter se consilio definierunt adversus præceptum Regis in omnibus locis celebrare ordinationes Pontificum, cogitantes aut Regis iracundiam, si qua forsan existeret, mitigandam, quò facilius ordinatim suis plebibus viverent, aut si persecutionis violentia nasceretur, coronandos etiam fidei confessione, quos dignos inveniebant promotione.* It was full of bravery, and Christian sprite. *The Bishops resolved for all the edict against new ordination of Bishops to obey God, rather then man, and to consecrate Bishops in all places, hoping the King would be appeased, or if not, yet those whom they thought worthy of a Mitre were in a faire disposition to receive a Crowne of Martyrdome.* They did so. *Fit repentè communis assumptio*, and they all striv'd who should be first, and thought a blessing would outstrip the hindmost. They were sure they might go to heaven (though persecuted) under the conduct of a *Bishop*, they knew, without him the ordinary passage was obstructed.

Pius

Pius the first, Bishop *of Rome*, and *Martyr*, speaking of them that calumniate, and disgrace their *Bishops* endeavouring to make them infamous, they adde (saith he) evill to evill, and grow worse, *non intelligentes quòd Ecclesia Dei in Sacerdotibus consistit, & crescit in templum Dei; Not considering that* THE CHURCH OF GOD DOTH CONSIST, *or is established in* BISHOPS, *and growes up to a holy Temple?* To him I am most willing to adde S. *Hierome*, because he is often obtruded in defiance of the cause. *Ecclesiæ salus in summi Sacerdotis dignitate pendet, The safety of the Church depends upon the Bishops dignity.*

Epist. 2.

adverf. Lucifer. cap. 4.

§ 46.

THE Reason which S. *Hierome* gives, presses this businesse to a further particular. *For if an eminent dignity, and an Vnmatchable power be not given to him, tot efficientur schismata, quot Sacerdotes.* So that he makes *Bishops* therefore *necessary* because without them the Unity of a Church cannot be preserved; and we know that unity, and being, are of equall extent, and if the Unity of the Church depends upon the *Bishop*, then where there is no *Bishop*, no pretence to a *Church*; and therefore to separate from the *Bishop* makes a man at least a *Schismatick*; For Unity which the Fathers presse so often, they make to be dependant on the *Bishop. Nihil sit in vobis quod possit vos dirimere, sed Vnimini Episcopo, subjecti Deo per illum in Christo* (saith S. *Ignatius.*) *Let nothing divide you, but be united to your* Bishop, *being subiect to God in Christ through your* Bishop.

For they are schismaticks that separate from their Bishop.

Epist. ad Magnes.

And

And it is his *congè* to the people of Smyrna to whom he writ in his epistle to *Polycarpus*, *opto vos semper valere in Deo nostro Iesu Christo, in quo manete per Vnitatem Dei & Episcopi, Farewell in Christ Iesus, in whom remaine by the Vnity of God and of the* Bishop. * *Quantò vos beatiores judico qui dependetis ab illo* [*Episcopo*] *vt Ecclesia à Domino Iesu, & Dominus à Patre suo, vt omnia per Vnitatem consentiant. Blessed people are ye that depend upon your Bishop, as the Church on Christ, and Christ on God, that all things may consent in Vnity.*

Ad Ephes.

S. Cyprian. ep. 55.

* *Neq; enim aliundè hæreses obortæ sunt, aut nata sunt schismata, quàm inde quòd Sacerdoti Dei non obtemperatur, nec unus in Ecclesiâ ad tempus Sacerdos, & ad tempus Iudex vice Christi cogitatur. Hence come* Schismes, *hence spring* Heresyes *that the Bishop is not obeyed, and admitted alone to be the high Priest, alone to be the Iudge.* The same, S. *Cyprian* repeates againe, and by it, we may see his meaning clearer. *Qui vos audit, me audit &c: Indeenim hæreses & schismata obortæ sunt & oriuntur, dum Episcopus qui unus est, & Ecclesiæ præest superbâ quorundam præsumptione contemnitur, & homo dignatione Dei honoratus, indignus hominibus judicatur.* The pride and peeviſh haughtineſſe of ſome factious people that contemne their Biſhops is the cauſe of all hereſy and Schiſme. And therefore it was ſo ſtrictly forbidden by the Ancient *Canons*, that any Man ſhould have any meetings, or erect an Altar out of the communion of his Biſhop, that if any man prov'd delinquent in this particular, he was puniſh'd

Epist. 69.

nish'd with the highest censures, as appeares in the 32 *Canon of the Apostles*, in the 6th *Canon of the Councell of Gangra*, the 5th *Canon of the Councell of Antioch*, and the great Councell of *Chalcedon*, all which I have before cited. The summe is this, The *Bishop* is the band, and ligature of the Churches Unity; and separation from the *Bishop* is διχοστασιας σύμβολον, as *Theodorets* expession is; *a Symbol of faction*, and he that separates is a Schismatick. Act. 4.

But how if the *Bishop* himselfe be a heretick, or schismatick? May we not then separate? Yes, if he be judg'd so by a *Synod of Bishops*, but then he is sure to be depos'd too, and then in these cases no separation from a *Bishop*. For till he be declar'd so, his communion is not to be forsaken by the subjects of his dioceese, least they by so doing become *their Iudges judge*, and when he is declar'd so, no need of withdrawing from obedience to the *Bishop*, for the heretick, or schismatick must be no longer *Bishop*. * But let the case be what it will be, no separation from a *Bishop*, *ut sic*, can be lawfull; and yet if there were a thousand cases in which it were lawfull to separate from a *Bishop*, yet in no case is it lawfull to separate from *Episcopacy*; That is the quintessence, and spirit of schisme, and a direct overthrow to Christianity, and a confronting of a Divine institution.

§. 47. And Heretick,

* BUt is it not also heresie? *Aërius* was condemned for heresie by the Catholike Church. The heresie from whence the *Aërians* were denomina-

ted was, *sermo furiosus magis quàm humanæ conditionis, & dicebat, Quid est Episcopus ad Presbyterum, nihil differt hic ab illo. A mad, and an unmanly heresie, to say that a Bishop, and a Priest are all one.* So *Epiphanius.* *hæres. 75.* *Assumpsit autem Ecclesia, & In Toto Mundo Assensus Factus Est, antequam esset Aërius, & qui ab ipso appellantur Aëriani.* And the good Catholike Father is so angry at the heretick *Aërius*, that he thinks his name was given him by Providence, and he is call'd *Aërius, ab aëreis spiritibus pravitatis*, for he was possessed with an uncleane spirit, he could never else been the inventer of such hereticall pravity. S. *Austin* also reckons him in the accursed roll of hereticks, and adds at the conclusion of his Catalogue, that he is No Catholike Christian that assents to any of the foregoing Doctrines, amongst which, this is one of the principall. *Philastrius* does as much for him.

But against this it will be objected. first, That heresies in the Primitive Catalogues are of a large extent, and every dissent from a publike opinion, was esteemed heresie. 2ly, *Aërius* was called heretick, for denying prayer for the dead. And why may he not be as blameless in equalling a Bishop, and a Presbyter, as in that other, for which he also is condemn'd by *Epiphanius*, and S. *Austin*. 3ly, He was never condemn'd by any Councell, and how then can he be called heretick?

I answer; that dissent from a publike, or a received opinion was never called heresie, unless the contrary truth was indeed a part of Catholike doctrine.

For

For the Fathers many of them did so, as S. *Austin* from the *Millenary* opinion; yet none ever reckon'd them in the Catalogues of hereticks; but such things only set them downe there, which were either directly opposite to Catholike beliefe, though *in minoribus articulis*, or to a holy life. 2ly, It is true that *Epiphanius* and S. *Austin* reckon his denying prayer for the dead to be one of his owne opinions, and hereticall. But I cannot help it if they did, let him and them agree it, they are able to answer for themselves. But yet they accused him also of Arianisme, and shall we therefore say that Arianisme was no heresie, because the Fathers call'd him heretick in one particular upon a wrong principall? We may as well say this, as deny the other. 3ly, He was not condemned by any Councell. No. For his heresie was ridiculous, and a scorne to all wise men; as *Epiphanius* observes, and it made no long continuance, neither had it any considerable party. * But yet this is certaine, that *Epiphanius*, & *Philastrius*, & S. *Austin* call'd this opinion of *Aërius* a *heresie* and against the Catholike beliefe. And themselves affirme that the Church did so; and then it would be considered, that it is but a sad imployment to revive old heresies, and make them a peice of the New religion.

And yet after all this, if I mistake not, although *Aërius* himselfe was so inconsiderable as not to be worthy noting in a Councell, yet certainly the one halfe of his error is condemn'd for heresie in one of the foure *Generall Councells*, *viz.* the first Councell of *Constantinople*. αἱρετικὸς ὁ Λέγων, τοὺς τὰ πάλαι τῆ Ἐκ- Can. 6.

 κλησίας

κλησίας ἀποχηρυχθέντας, καὶ τὰς μὴ ταῦτα φρονούσας ἀναθεματισθέντας. We call all them hereticks whom the Ancient Church hath condemn'd, and whom we shall anathematize. Will not *Aërius* come under one of these titles for a condemn'd heretick? Then see forward. περὶ ὧν τέτοις καὶ τοῖς πάλαι μὲν καὶ νῦν ὑγιῆ πεφρονημένας ὁμολογεῖν, ἀποσχίσαντας δὲ καὶ ἀνθισταμένους τοῖς καινοτομοῦσι νῦν ἐπισκόποις. Here is enough for *Aërius* and all his hyperaspists, new and old; for the *holy Councell* condemnes them for hereticks who doe indeed confesse the true faith, but separate from their *Bishops*, and make conventicles apart from his Communion. Now this I the rather urge because an Act of Parliament made 1° of *Elizabeth* does make this Councell, and the other three of *Nice*, *Ephesus*, and *Chalcedon*, the rule of judging heresyes.

I end this particular with the saying of the Councell of *Paris* against the *Acephali* (who were the branch of a Crabstock and something like *Aërius*,) cited by *Burchard*; *Nullâ ratione Clerici aut Sacerdotes habendi sunt, qui sub nullius Episcopi disciplinâ & providentiâ gubernantur. Tales enim Acephalos, id est sine capite Priscæ Ecclesiæ consuetudo nuncupavit. They are by no meanes to be accounted Clergy-men, or Priests, that will not be governed by a Bishop.* For such men the Primitive Church call'd ἀκεφαλὲς, that is, *headlesse*, wittlesse people.

lib. 2. decret. cap. 226.

This onely. *Acephali* was the title of a Sect, a formall heresy, and condemn'd by the Ancient Church, say the Fathers of the Councell of *Paris*. Now if we can learn exactly what they were, it may perhaps

perhaps be another conviction for the necessity of *Episcopall* regiment. *Nicephorus* can best informe us. *Eodem tempore, & Acephali, quorum dux Severus Antiochenus fuit* &c: *Severus of Antioch was the first broacher of this heresy.* But why were they called *Acephali? id est, sine capite, quem sequuntur hæretici; Nullus enim eorum reperitur author à quo exorti sunt* (saith *Isidore*). But this cannot be, for their head is knowne, *Severus* was the heresiarch. But then why are they called *Acephali? Nicephorus* gives this reason, and withall a very particular account of their heresy, *Acephali autem ob eam causam dicti sunt, quòd sub Episcopis non fuerint. They refused to live under Bishops.* Thence they had their *Name.* what was their heresie? They denied the distinction of Natures in Christ. That was one of their heresies, but they had more; for they were *trium capitulorum in Chalcedone impugnatores*, saith *Isidore*, they opposed three *Canons* of the Councell of *Chalcedon.* One we have heard, what their other heresies were, we doe not so well know, but by the Canon of the *Councell of Paris*, and the intimation of their name we are guided to the knowledge of a second; They refused to live under the government of a *Bishop.* And this also was *impugnatio unius articuli in Chalcedone*, for the eighth *Canon* of the Councell of *Chalcedon* commands that the Clergy should be under Episcopall government. But these *Acephali* would not, they were *antiepiscopall men*, and therefore they were condemn'd hereticks; condemn'd, In the Councell *of Paris*, of *Sevill*, and of *Chalcedon.*

lib. 18. ca. 45 Eccles. hist.

lib. 8. cap. 5. Etymol.

vbi supra.

But the more particular account that *Nicephorus* gives of them I will now insert, because it is of great use. *Proinde [illegible]iscopis, & Sacerdotibus apud eos defunctis, neq; baptismus juxtà solennem, atq; receptum Ecclesiæ morem apud eos administratur, neq; oblatio, aut res aliqua divina facta, ministeriumvè Ecclesiasticum, sicuti mos est, celebratum est. Communionem verò illi à plurimo tempore asservatam habentes ferijs paschalibus in minutissimas incisam partes convenientibus ad se hominibus dederunt. Quo tempore quam quisq; voluisset placitam sibi sumebat potestatem. Et propterea quod quilibet, quod si visum esset, fidei insertum volebat, quamplurima defectorum, atq; hæreticorum turba exorta est.* It is a story worthy observation. *When any Bishop dyed they would have no other consecrated in succession, and therefore could have no more Priests when any of them dyed.* But how then did they to baptize their Children? Why, they were faine to make shift, and doe it without any Church-solemnity. But, how did they for the Holy Sacrament, for that could not be consecrated without a Priest, and he not ordain'd without a Bishop? True, but therefore they, while they had a Bishop, got a great deale of bread consecrated, and kept a long time, and when Easter came, cutt it into small bitts, or crummes rather, to make it goe the farther, and gave it to their people. And must we doe so too? God forbid. But how did they when all that was gone? For crummes would not last alwaies. The story specifies it not, but yet I suppose they then got a Bishop for their necessity to help

help them to some more Priests, and some more crummes; for I find the Councell of *Sevill* the Fathers saying, *Ingressus est ad nos quidem ex hæresi Acephalorum Episcopus*; They had then it seemes got a *Bishop*, but this they would seldome have, and never but when their necessity drave them to it. But was this all the inconvenience of the want of *Bishops*? No. *For every man* (saith *Nicephorus*) *might doe what he list, & if he had a mind to it, might put his fancy into the Creed*, and thence came innumerable troopes of Schismaticks and Hereticks. So that this device was one simple heresie in the root, but it was forty heresies in the fruit, and branches; clearely proving that want of *Bishops* is the cause of all Schisme, & recreant opinios that are imaginable. *Can.* 12.

I summe this up with the saying of S. *Clement* the Disciple of S. *Peter*, *Si autem vobis Episcopis non obedierint omnes Presbyteri*, &c. *tribus, & linguæ non obtemperaverint, non solùm infames, sed & extorres à regno Dei, & consortio fidelium, ac à limitibus Sancti Dei Ecclesiæ alieni erunt. All Priests, and Clergy-men, and People, and Nations, and Languages that doe not obey their Bishop shall be shut forth of the communion of Holy Church here, and of Heaven hereafter.* It runnes high, but I cannot help it, I doe but translate *Ruffinus*, as he before translated S. *Clement*. *Epist.* 3.

§. 48. And Bishops were alwaies in the Church, men of great Honour.

IT seemes then we must have *Bishops*. But must we have Lord *Bishops* too? That is the question now, but such an one as the Primitive piety could never have imagined. For, could they, to whom *Bishops* were

were placed in a right and a true light, they who believed, and saw them to be the Fathers of their soules, the *Guardian of their life and manners* (as King *Edgar call'd S. Dunstan*) the guide of their consciences, the instruments and conveyances of all the Blessings heaven uses to powre upon us, by the ministration of the holy Gospell; would they, that thought their lives a cheap exchange for a free, and open communion with a Catholick *Bishop*; would they have contested upon an aëry title, and the imaginary priviledge of an honour, which is farre lesse then their spirituall dignity, but infinitely lesse then the burden, and charge of the soules of all their Dioceſſe? Charity thinks nothing too much, and that love is but little, that grutches at the good words a *Bishoprick* carries with it.

However; let us see whether titles of honour be either unfit in themselves to be given to *Bishops*, or what the guise of Christendome hath been in her spirituall heraldry.

1. S. *Ignatius* in his Epistle to the Church of *Smyrna* gives them this command. *Honora Episcopum ut Principem Sacerdotum, imaginem Dei referentem. Honour the Bishop as the image of God, as the* PRINCE OF PRIESTS. Now since honour, and excellency are termes of mutuall relation, and all excellency that is in men, and things, is but a ray of divine excellency; so farre as they participate of God, so farre they are honourable. Since then the Bishop carries the impresse of God upon his forehead, and bears *Gods image*, certainly this participation

tion of such perfection makes him very honourable. And since *honor est in honorante*, it is not enough that the *Bishop* is honourable in himselfe, but it tells us our duty, we must honour him, we must doe him honour: and of all the honours in the world, that of words is the cheapest, and the least.

S. *Paul* speaking of the honour due to the *Prelates* of the Church, οἱ καλῶς προεστῶτες πρεσβύτεροι διπλῆς τιμῆς ἀξιούσθωσαν. *Let them be accounted worthy of double honour.* And one of the honours that he there means is a costly one, an honour of *Maintenance*, the other must certainly be an honour of *estimate*, and that's cheapest. * The Councell of *Sardis* speaking of the severall steps and capacities of promotion to the height of Episcopacy, uses this expression, καὶ αὐτὸς ἄξιος τῆς θείας ἱερωσύνης νομισθεὶς, τῆς μείζονος ἀπολαύσαι τιμῆς. *He that shall be found worthy of so Divine a Priesthood, let him be advanced to the* HIGHEST HONOUR. * *Ego procidens ad pedes ejus rogabam, excusans me, & declinans* HONOREM CATHEDRÆ, *& potestatem*, (saith S. *Clement*, when S. *Peter* would have advanc'd him to *the Honour* and power of the Bishops chaire.) But in the third epistle speaking of the dignity of *Aaron* the High-Priest, and then by analogy, of the *Bishop*, who although he be a Minister in the order of *Melchisedek*, yet he hath also the *honour of Aaron*, *Omnis enim Pontifex sacro crismate perunctus, & in civitate constitutus, & in Scripturis sacris conditus, charus & preciosus hominibus oppidò esse debet. Every High Priest ordained in the Citty* (viz. *a Bishop*) *ought forthwith to*

Can. 10. Græc.

Epist. 1. ad Iacobum.

be Deare, and Precious in the eyes of men. Quem quasi Christi locum tenentem honorare omnes debent, eiq; servire, & obedientes ad salutem suam fideliter existere, scientes quòd sive honor, sive injuria quæ ei defertur, in Christum redundat, & a Christo in Deum. The Bishop is Christ's vicegerent, and therefore he is to be obeyed, knowing that whether it be honour, or injury that is done to the Bishop, it is done to Christ, and so to God. * And indeed what is the saying of our blessed Saviour himselfe? *He that despiseth you, despiseth mee.* If *Bishops* be Gods Ministers and in higher order then the rest, then although all discountenance, and disgrace done to the Clergy reflect upon Christ, yet what it done to the *Bishop* is farre more, and then there is the same reason of the honour. And if so, then the Question will prove but an odde one; even this, whether Christ be to be honour'd or no, or depressed to the common estimate of Vulgar people? for if the Bishops be, then he is. This is the condition of the Question.

2. Consider wee, that all Religions, and particularly all Christianity did give titles of honour to their *High-Priests*, and *Bishops* respectively. * I shall not need to instance in the great honour of the Priestly tribe among the Iewes, and how highly Honourable *Aaron* was in proportion. Prophets were called [*Lords*] in holy Scripture. [*Art not thou* My Lord *Elijah?*] said *Obed Edom* to the Prophet. [*Knowest thou not that God will take* Thy Lord *from thy head this day?*] said the children in the Prophets Schooles. So it was then. And in the new

New Testament we find a Prophet HONOURD every where, but in his own Country. And to the *Apostles* and Presidents of Churches greater titles of honour given, then was ever given to man by secular complacence and insinuation. ANGELS, and *Apocal.* 1. GOVERNOURS, and FATHERS OF OUR FAITH, and *1. Corinth.* 4. STARRS, LIGHT OF THE WORLD, the CROWNE OF THE CHURCH, APOSTLES OF *John* 10. IESUS CHRIST, nay, GODS, *viz.* to whom the word of God came; and of the compellation of *Apostles*, particularly, S. *Hierom* saith, that when S. *Paul* called himselfe the *Apostle of Iesus Christ*, it *In Titum.* was as Magnifically spoken, as if he had said, *Præfectus prætorio Augusti Cæsaris, Magister exercitûs Tiberii Imperatoris*; And yet Bishops are Apostles, and so called in Scripture. I have prooved that already.

Indeed our blessed *Saviour* in the case of the two sonnes of *Zebedee*, forbad them to expect by vertue of their *Apostolate* any *Princely titles*, in order to a Kingdome, and an earthly Principality. For that was it which the ambitious woman sought for her sonnes, *viz.* faire honour, and dignity in an earthly Kingdome; for such a Kingdome they expected with their *Messias*. To this their expectation, our Saviours answer is a direct *antithesis*; And that made the *Apostles* to be angry at the two Petitioners, as if they had meant to supplant the rest, and yet the best preferment from them, to wit, in a temporall Kingdome. *No*; (saith our blessed Saviour) ye are all deceived. [*The Kings of the Nations in-*

Matth. 20. Mark 10. Luke 22. *deed doe exercise authority, and are called* εὐεργέται, *Benefactors*] so the word signifies, [*Gracious Lords*] so we read it, [*But it shall not be so with you.*] what shall not be so with them? shall not they exercise authority? [*Who then is that faithfull and wise Steward whom his Lord made ruler over his Houshold?*] Surely the Apostles, or no body. Had Christ authority? Most certainly. Then so had the Apostles, for Christ gave them his, with a *sicut misit me Pater, &c.* Well! the Apostles might, and we know they did exercise authority. What then *shall not be so with them?* shall not they be called εὐεργέται; Indeed if S. *Marke* had taken that title upon him in *Alexandria*, the *Ptolomies*, whose Honourary appellative that was, would have question'd him Highly for it. But if we goe to the sense of the word, the Apostles might be *Benefactors*, and therefore might be called so. But what then? Might they not be called *Gratious Lords*? The word would have done no hurt if it had not been an ensigne of a secular Principality.

For as for the word [*Lord*] I know no more prohibition for that, then for being called RABBI, or MASTER, or DOCTOR, or FATHER. What shall we think now? May we not be called DOCTORS? [*God hath constituted in his Church Pastors, and Doctors*, saith S. *Paul.*] Therefore we may be called so. But what of the other, the prohibition runs alike for all, as is evident in the severall places of the Gospells, and may no man be called MASTER, or FATHER? let an answer be thought upon for these,

Matth. 23. 8, 9. 10. Ephes. 4.

and

and the same will serve for the other also without any sensible error. It is not the word, it is *the ambitious seeking of a temporall principality as the issue of Christianity, and an affixe of the Apostolate that Christ interdicted his Apostles.* * And if we marke it, our B. *Saviour* points it out himselfe. [*The Princes of the Nations* κατακυριεύουσιν, *exercise authority over them, and are called Benefactors,* οὐχ' οὕτως ἔσται ἐν ὑμῖν. *It shall not be so with you.* Not so how? Not as the Princes of the Gentiles, for theirs is a *temporall regiment*, your Apostolate must be *Spirituall.* They rule as Kings, you as fellow servants, καὶ ὃς ἐὰν θέλῃ ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι πρῶτος, ἔστω ὑμῶν διάκονος. *He that will be first amongst you, let him be your Minister, or servant;* It seems then among Christs Disciples there may be a Superiority, when there is a Minister or servant; But it must be ἐν τῇ διακονείᾳ that this greatnesse doth consist, it must be in *doing the greatest service and ministration that the superiority consists in.* But more particularly, it must be ὥσπερ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. It must not be [*as the Princes of the Gentiles*] but it must be [*as the sonne of man*] so Christ saies expressely. And how was that? why, *he came to Minister and to serve*, and yet in the lowest act of his humility (the washing his Disciples feet) he told them, [*ye call me Lord, and Master, and ye say well, for so I am*] it may be *so with you.* Nay it must be *as the sonne of Man*; But then, the being called *Rabbi*, or *Lord*, nay the being *Lord in spirituali Magisterio & regimine, in a spirituall superintendency*, and ὥσπερ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, may stand

Luke 22.

John 13.

with the humility of the Gospell, and office of Ministration.

So that now I shall not need to take advantage of the word * καταυειδύσιν, which signifies to rule with more then a politicall regiment, even with an absolute, and despotick, and is so used in *holy Scripture*, viz. *in sequiorem partem.* God gave authority to Man over the creatures, καταυειδώσατε is the word in the *septuagint*, and we know the power that man hath over beasts, is to kill, and to keep alive. And thus to our blessed Saviour, the power that God gave him over his enemies is expressed by καταυειδύσι. καταυείδυς ἐν μέσῳ ἀχθρῶν σου. And this wee know how it must be exercised, ἐν ῥάβδῳ σιδηρᾷ *with a rod of iron*, ὡς σκεῦη κεραμέως συντρίψεις αὐτές. *He shall break them in pieces like a potters vessell.* That's καταυειδύειν. But *it shall not be so with you.*

* *In locis ubi supra.*

Gen. 1.

Psal. 110.

Psal. 2.

But let this be as true as it will. The answer needs no way to rely upon a *Criticisme.* It is cleare, that the forme of Regiment only is distinguished, not all Regiment, and authority taken away. οὐχ ὅπως, but ὥσπερ ὁ υἱὸς, *Not as the Kings of the Gentiles, but as the sonne of man*; so must your regiment be, for *sicut misit me Pater, &c. As my father hath sent me, even so send I you.* It must be a government, not for your Impery, but for the service of the Church. So that it is not for your advancement, but the publick ministery that you are put to rule over the Household. * And thus the Fathers expresse the authority and regiment of Bishops. * *Qui vocatur ad Episcopatum non ad Principatum vocatur, sed ad servitutem totius Eccle-*

sia (saith *Origen.*) And S. *Hierom*; *Episcopi Sacerdotes se esse noverint, non Dominos*; And yet S. *Hierom* himselfe writing to S. *Austin*, calls him, *Domine verè sancte, & suscipiende Papa.* * *Forma Apostolica hæc est, Dominatio interdicitur, indicitur Ministratio.* It is no Principality that the Apostles have, but it is a Ministery; a Ministery in chiefe, the officers of which Ministration must governe, and wee must obey. They must governe not in a *temporall* regiment by vertue of their Episcopacy, but in a *spirituall*, not for honour to the Rulers, so much as for benefit and service to the subject. So S. *Austin*. *Nomen est operis, non honoris, ut intelligat se non esse Episcopum qui præesse dilexerit, non prodesse.* And in the fourteenth chapter of the same book, *Qui imperant serviunt ijs rebus quibus videntur Imperare. Non enim dominandi cupidine imperant, sed officio consulendi, nec principandi superbiâ, sed providendi misericordiâ.* And all this is intimated in the Prophetical visions, where the regiment of Christ is design'd by the face of a man; and the Empire of the world, by Beasts. The first is the regiment of a *Father*, the second of a *King*. The first spirituall, the other secular. And of the Fatherly authority it is that the Prophet saies, Instead of *Fathers* thou shalt have *Children*, whom thou maist make *Princes* in all lands. This (say the Fathers) is spoken of the Apostles and their Successors the Bishops, who may be ἄρχοντες Ἐκκλησιῶν, *Princes or Rulers of Churches, not Princes of Kingdomes* by vertue or challenge of their Apostolate. But if this Ecclesiasticall rule, or chiefty

homil. 6. in Isai.

S. Bernard. lib. 10. de consideral.

lib. 19. de civit. Dei. cap. 19.

cheifty be interdicted, I wonder how the Presidents of the Presbyters, the προεδροι in the Reformed Churches will acquit themselves? How will their *Superiority* be reconciled to the place, though it be but *temporary?* For is it a sinne, if it continues, and no sinne if it lasts but for a weeke? or is it lawfull to sinne, and domineere, and Lord it over their Brethren for a weeke together? * But suppose it were, what will they say, that are perpetuall Dictators? *Calvin* was perpetuall president, and *Beza*, till *Danæus* came to *Geneva*, even for many years together? * But beyond all this how can the Presbytery which is a fixt lasting body rule and governe in causes Spirituall and Consistoriall, and that over all *Princes*, and *Ministers*, and people, and that for ever? For is it a sinne in *Episcopacy* to doe so, and not in the *Presbytery?* If it be lawfull here, then *Christ did not interdict it to the Apostles*, for who will think that a Presbytery shall have leave to domineere, and (as they call it now a dayes) to Lord it over their Brethren, when a Colledge of Apostles shall not be suffered to governe? but if the Apostles may governe, then we are brought to a right understanding of our *Saviours* saying to the sonnes of *Zebedee*, and then also, their successors, the *Bishops* may doe the same.

If I had any further need of answer or escape, it were easy to pretend, that this being a particular directory to the Apostles, was to expire with their persons. So S. *Cyprian* intimates. *Apostoli pari fuêre consortio prædîti, & honoris, & dignitatis*; and indeed

De Unitat. Eccles.

indeed this may be concluding against the Supremacy of S. *Peter's* Successors, but will be no waies pertinent to impugne Episcopall authority. For *inter se* they might be equall, and yet Superiour to the Presbyters, and the people.

Lastly, [*It shall not be so with you*] so Christ said, *non designando officium*, but *Sortem*; *not their duty, but their lot*; intimating that their future condition should not be honorary, but full of trouble, not advanc'd, but persecuted. But I had rather insist on the first answer; in which I desire it be remembred, that I said, seeking temporall Principality to be forbidden the Apostles, *as an Appendix to the office of an Apostle*. For in other capacities *Bishops* are as receptive of honour and *temporall* principalities as other men. *Bishops vt sic* are not secular Princes, must not seeke for it; But some secular Princes may be Bishops, as in *Germany*, and in other places to this day they are. For it is as unlawfull for a Bishop to have any Land, as to have a Country, and a single acre is no more due to the Order, then a Province; but both these may be conjunct in the same person, though still by vertue of Christs precept, the functions and capacities must be distinguish'd; according to the saying of *Synesius* σωιάσθειν τὴν βασιλείαν τῇ ἱερωσύνῃ συγκλώθειν ὅτι τὰ ἀσύγκλωστα. *To confound and intermixe the Kingdome and the Priesthood, is to joyne things incompossible and inconsistent*, Inconsistent (I say) not in person, but absolutely discrepant in function.

3. Consider we, that S. *Peter*, when he speakes

of the duteous subordination of *Sarah* to her Husband *Abraham*, he propounds her as an example to all married women, in these words [*shee obeyed Abraham, and called him Lord*] why was this spoken to Christian women, but that they should doe so too? And is it imaginable that such an Honourable compellation as Christ allowes every woman to give to her husband, a Mechanick, a hard-handed artisan, he would forbid to those eminent pillars of his Church, those lights of Christendome whom he really indued with a plenitude of power for the regiment of the Catholike Church. *Credat Apella.*

4. PASTOR, and FATHER, are as honourable titles as any. They are honourable in Scripture. *Honour thy Father* &c: Thy Father, in all senses. They are also made sacred by being the appellatives of *Kings*, and *Bishops*, and that not onely in secular addresses, but even in *holy Scripture*, as is knowne.

Acts. 15. Rom. 12. Hebr. 13.

* Adde to this; ἡγέμονες, προεστῶτες, and ποιμαίνοντες are used in Scripture for the *Prelates* of the Church, and I am certaine, that, *Duke*, and *Captaine*, *Rulers*, and *Commanders* are but just the same in English, that the other are in Greeke, and the least of these is as much as κύριος, or *Lord*. And then if we consider that since Christ erected a *spirituall regiment*, and us'd words of secular honour to expresse it, as in the instances above, although Christ did interdict a secular principality, yet he forbad not a secular title; He us'd many himselfe.

5. The voyce of the Spouse, the holy Church hath alwaies expressed their honourable estimate in reverentiall

reverentiall compellations and Epithets of honour to their *Bishops*, and have taught us so to doe. * Bishops were called *Principes Ecclesiarum, Princes of the Churches.* I had occasion to instance it in the question of Iurisdiction. Indeed the third Councell of *Carthage* forbad the *Bishop* of *Carthage* to be called *Princeps Sacerdotum*, or *summus Sacerdos*, or *aliquid hujusmodi*, but onely *primæ sedis Episcopus.* I know not what their meaning was, unlesse they would dictate a lesson of humility to their *Primate*, that he might remember the principality not to be so much in his person, as in the See, for he might be called *Bishop of the prime See.* But whatsoever fancy they had at *Carthage*, I am sure it was a guise of Christendome, not to speake of *Bishops sine præfatione honoris, but with honourable mention.* τῷ Κυρίῳ μακαριότατῳ, *To our most blessed* LORD. So the letters were superscribed to *Iulius* Bishop *of Rome* from some of his Brethren; in *Sozomen.* Let no man *lib. 3. cap. 23.* speake Untruths of mee μηδὲ τῶν νεῶν τῶν ἐπισκόπων, *Epist. ad* *Nor of* MY LORDS THE BISHOPS, said S. *Gregory* *Greg. Nyssen.* *Nazianzen.* The Synodicall book of the Councell of *Constantinople* is inscribed DOMINIS REVE- *Theodoret.* RENDISSIMIS, *ac pijssimis Fratribus ac Collegis,* *lib. 5. ca. 9.* *Damaso, Ambrosio* &c: *To our most Reverend* LORDS, *and holy Brethren* &c: And the Councell of *Illyricum* sending their Synodall letters to the *Bishops* of *Asia*, by *Bishop Elpidius*, *Hæc pluribus* (say they) *persequi non est visum, quòd miserimus vnum ex omnibus,* DOMINUM, *& Collegam nostrum Elpidium, qui cognosceret, esset ne sicut dictum fuerat à* *Theodor. lib. 4. cap. 9.*

DOMINO, *& Collegâ nostro Eustathio.* Our *Lord*, and *Brother Elpidius.* Our *Lord* and *Brother Eustathius.* * The oration in the Councell of *Epaunum* begins thus. *Quòd præcipientibus tantis* DOMINIS MEIS *ministerium proferendi sermonis assumo* &c: *The Prolocutor tooke that office on him, at the command of so many* GREAT LORDS THE BISHOPS. * When the Church of *Spayne* became Catholike, and abjur'd the Arian heresy, King *Recaredus* in the third Councell of *Toledo* made a speech to the *Bishops*, *Non incognitum reor esse vobis*, REVERENDISSIMI *Sacerdotes* &c: *Non credimus vestram latere* SANCTITATEM &c: *vestra Cognovit* BEATITUDO &c: VENERANDI PATRES &c: And these often. Your *Holinesse*, your *Blessednesse*, *Most Reverend*, *Venerable Fathers*; Those were the addresses the King made to the Fathers of the Synod. Thus it was when *Spaine* grew Catholike; But not such a Speech to be found in all the Arian records. They amongst them us'd but little Reverence to their *Bishops*. But the instances of this kind are innumerable. Nothing more ordinary in Antiquity then to speake of *Bishops* with the titles of κύριοι πιώτατοι, θεοφιλέστατοι, ἁγιώτατοι, *Domine verè Sancte*, *& suscipiende Papa*, So S. *Hierome* a Presbyter, to S. *Austin* a *Bishop*. *Secundùm enim honorum vocabula quæ jam Ecclesiæ usus obtinuit Episcopatus Presbyterio major est*, saith S. *Austin*. *Episcopacy is Greater then the office and dignity of a Presbyter according to the* TITLES OF HONOUR *which the custome of the Church hath introduc'd.* * But I shall summe up these particulars

Theodor. lib. 1. c. 4. & c. 5. Athanas. Apolog. 2.

Epist. 17. 18. 19 apud S. Augustin.

ticulars in a torall, which is thus expressed by S. *Chrysostome. Hæretici à Diabolo* HONORUM VOCABULA *Episcopis non dare didicerunt. Hereticks have learned of the Devill not to give due titles of honour to Bishops.* The good *Patriarch* was angry surely when he said so. * For my owne particular, I am confident that my Lords the Bishops doe so undervalue any fastuous, or pompous title, that were not the duty of their people in it, they would as easily reject them, as it is our duties piously to use them. But if they still desire appellatives of honour, we must give them, they are their due, if they desire them not, they deserve them much more. So that either for their humility, or however for their works sake we must [*highly honour them that have the rule over us*] It is the precept of S. *Paul*, and S. *Cyprian* observing how Curious our *blessed Saviour* was that he might give honour to the Priests of the Iewes, even then when they were reeking in their malice hot as the fire of Hell; he did it to teach us a duty. *Docuit enim Sacerdotes veros* LEGITIME ET PLENE HONORARI *dum circa falsos Sacerdotes ipse talis extitit.* It is the argument he uses to procure a full *honour* to the *Bishop*.

in Psal. 13. apud Baron. An. Dom. 58. n. 2.

1. Thessal. 5. 13.

Epist. 65.

* To these I adde; If sitting in a THRONE even above the seate of Elders be a title of a great dignity, then we have it confirmed by the voice of all Antiquity calling the *Bishops chaire*, A THRONE, and the investiture of a Bishop in his Church AN INTHRONIZATION. *Quando* INTHRONIZANTUR *propter communem utilitatem Episcopi* &c: saith P.

Anterus in his decretall Epistle to the *Bishops* of *Bætica* and *Toledo*. INTHRONING is the Primitive word for the consecration of a Bishop. *Sedes in Episcoporum Ecclesiis excelsæ constitutæ & præparatæ, UT THRONUS speculationem & potestatem judicandi à Domino sibi datam materiam docent*, (saith *Vrban*). And S. *Ignatius* to his Deacon *Hero*, πεπ́ω δὲ εἰς τὸν παλαιὸν τῦ Κυρίυ Ιησῦ χειρῦ..... ὅτι ἀξίωσε μοὶ ὁ θεὸς Ἥρω. να ὀπὶ τῦ θρόνυ μυ, *I trust that the Father of our Lord Iesus Christ will show to me Hero sitting upon my* THRONE.

Epist. decret.

Epist. ad Heron.

* * The summe of all is this. *Bishops* if they must be at all, most certainly must be beloved, it is our dutyes, and their worke deserves it. S. *Paul* was as deare to the *Galathians*, as their eyes, and it is true eternally, *Formosi pedes Evangelizantium*, the feete of the Preachers of the Gospell are beauteous, and then much more of the chiefe. *Ideo ista prætulimus (charissimi) vt intelligatis potestatem Episcoporum vestrorum, in eisq; Deum venerem ini, & eos* UT ANIMAS VESTRAS *diligatis, vt quibus illi non communicant, non communicetis* &c: Now, love to our Superiours is ever honourable, for it is more then *amicitia*, that's amongst Peeres, but love to our Betters, is *Reverence, Obedience*, and *high Estimate*. And if we have the one, the dispute about the other would be a meere impertinence. I end this with the saying of S. *Ignatius, & vos decet non contemnere ætatem Episcopi, sed juxta Dei Patris arbitrium* OMNEM ILLI IMPERTIRI REVERENTIAM. *It is the* WILL OF GOD *the Father, that we should give all*

Vrban. ibid.

Epist. ad Magnes.

REVE-

REVERENCE, HONOUR, *or veneration to our Bishops.*

§. 49. And trusted with affayres of Secular interest.

WELL! However things are now, It was otherwise in the Old Religion; for no honour was thought too great for them whom God had honourd with so great degrees of approximation to himselfe in power, and authority. But then also they went further. For they thought whom God had intrusted with their soules, they might with an equall confidence trust with their personall actions, and imployments of greatest trust.

For it was Great Consideration that they who were *Antistites religionis* the *Doctors*, and great *Dictators* of Faith and conscience, should be the composers of those affayres in whose determination, a Divine wisdome, and interests of conscience and the authority of religion were the best ingredients.

But, it is worth observing how the Church and the Common-wealth did actions contrary to each other, in pursuance of their severall interests. The Common-wealth still enabled *Bishops* to take cognisance of causes, and the confidence of their owne people would be sure to carry them thither where they hop'd for faire issue, upon such good grounds as they might fairely expect from the Bishops abilityes, authority, and religion; But on the other side, the Church did as much decline them as shee could, and made sanctions against it so farre as shee might without taking from themselves all opportunities

tunities both of doing good to their people, and in-gaging the secular arme to their owne assistance. But this we shall see by consideration of particulars.

1. It was not *in Naturâ rei* unlawfull for *Bishops* to receive an office of secular imployment. S. *Paul's* tent-making was as much against the calling of an *Apostle*, as sitting in a secular tribunall is against the office of a *Bishop*. And it is hard, if we will not allow that to the conveniencès of a Republike which must be indulged to a private, personall necessity. But we have not S. *Paul's* example onely, but his rule too, according to Primitive exposition. [*Dare any of you having a matter before another goe to law before the Vnjust, and not before the Saints? If then ye have judgements of things pertaining to this life, set them to judge who are least esteemed in the Church*] who are they? The Clergy I am sure, now adayes. But S. *Ambrose* also thought that to be his meaning seriously. Let the *Ministers* of the Church be the *Iudges*. For by [*least esteemed*] he could not meane the most ignorant of the Laity, they would most certainly have done very strange justice, especially in such causes which they Understand not. No, but set them to judge who by their office are Servants, and Ministers of all, and those are the *Clergy* who (as *S. Paul's* expression is) *Preach not themselves, but Iesus to be the Lord, and themselves your servants for Iesus sake. Melius dicit apud Dei Ministros agere causam.* Yea but S. *Paul's* expression seemes to exclude the Governours

1. *Cor.* 6.

In hunc locum.

of

of the Church from intermedling. [*Is there not one wise man among you that is able to Iudge betweene his Brethren?*] Why Brethren, if Bishops and Priests were to be the Iudges, they are Fathers? The objection is not worth the noting, but onely for *S. Ambrose* his answer to it. *Ideò autem Fratrem Iudicem eligendum dicit, quià adhuc Rector Ecclesiæ illorum non erat ordinatus.* *S. Paul* us'd the word [*Brethren*] *for as yet a Bishop was not ordained amongst them of that Church*, intimating that the *Bishop* was to be the man, though till then, *in subsidium* any prudent Christian man might be imployed. *Vide etiam Augustin. de opere Monach. ca. 29.*

2. The Church did alwaies forbid to Clergymen A VOLUNTARY ASSUMPTION of ingagements in REBUS SÆCULI. So the sixth Canon of the *Apostles*, ὁ ἐπίσκοπος, ἢ πρεσβύτερος, ἢ διάκονος κοσμικὰς φροντίδας μὴ ἀναλαμβανέτω. εἰ δὲ μή, καθαιρείσθω. *A Bishop, and a Priest, and a Deacon, must not assume, or take on himselfe worldly cares. If he does, let him be depos'd.* Here the Prohibition is generall. *No worldly cares.* Not domestick. But how if they come on him by Divine imposition, or accident? That's nothing, if he does not assume them; that is, by his voluntary act acquire his owne trouble. So that if his secular imployment be an act of obedience, indeed it is trouble to him, but no sinne. But if he seekes it, for it selfe, it is ambition. In this sense also must the following Canon be understood. Κληρικὸς ἐπίτροπος διάκων καθαιρείσθω. *A Clerk must not be a Tutor, or Guardian, viz:* of secular trust, that is must not seeke a diversion from his imployment by voluntary Tutorship. *Can. 7. Latin. Vide Zonar. in can. Apostol.*

3. The Church also forbad all secular negotiation *for base ends*, not precisely the imployment it selfe, but the illnesse of the intention, and this indeed shee expressely forbids in her Canons. * *Pervenit ad Sanctam Synodum quòd quidam qui in Clero sunt allecti* PROPTER LUCRA TURPIA *conductores aliquarum possessionum fiant, & sæcularia negotia sub curâ suâ suscipiant, Dei quidem Ministerium parvipendentes, Sæcularium verò discurrentes domos &* PROPTER AVARITIAM *patrimoniorum sollicitudinem sumentes.* Clergy men farmers of lands, and did take upon them secular imployment FOR COVETOUS DESIGNES, and with neglect of the Church. These are the things the Councell complain'd of, and therefore according to this exigence the following Sanction is to be understood. *Decrevit itaq; hoc Sanctum magnumq; Concilium, nullum deinceps, non Episcopum, non Clericum vel Monachum aut possessiones conducère, aut negotijs sæcularibus se immiscere.* *No Bishop, No Clergy man, No Monke must farme grounds, nor ingage himselfe in secular businesse.* What in none? No, none, *præter pupillorum, si fortè leges imponant inexcusabilem curam, aut civitatis Episcopus Ecclesiasticarum rerum sollicitudinem habere præcipiat, aut Orphanorum, & viduarum earum quæ sine ullâ defensione sunt, ac personarum quæ maximè Ecclesiastico indigent adjutorio, & propter timorem Domini causa deposcat.* This Canon will doe right to the Question.

Concil. Chalced. Act. 15. can. 3.

All secular affaires, and bargaines either for covetousnesse, or with considerable disturbance of Church

Church offices are to be avoided. For a Clergy man must not be covetous, much lesse for covetise must he neglect his cure. To this purpose is that of the second Councell of *Arles*, *Clericus turpis lucri gratiâ aliquod genus negotiationis non exerceat.* But nor here, nor at *Chalcedon* is the prohibition absolute, nor declaratory of an inconsistence and incapacity; for, for all this, the *Bishop* or *Clerk* may doe any office that is *in piâ curâ*. He may undertake *the supravision of Widdowes*, and *Orphans*. And though he be forbid by the Canon of the *Apostles* to be a *guardian* of *pupills*, yet it is expounded here by this Canon of *Chalcedon*, for a voluntary seeking it is forbidden by the *Apostles*, but here it is permitted only with, *si fortè leges imponant*, if the Law, or Authority commands him, then he may undertake it. That is, if either the Emperor commands him, or if the *Bishop* permits him, then it is lawfull. But without such command or license it was against the Canon of the Apostles. And therefore S. *Cyprian* did himselfe severely punish *Geminius Faustinus*, one of the Priests of *Carthage*, for undertaking the executorship of the Testament of *Geminius Victor*: he had no leave of his *Bishop* so to doe, and for him of his own head to undertake that which would be an avocation of him from his office, did in S. *Cyprians* Consistory, deserve a censure. 3. By this Canon of *Chalcedon*, any Clerk may be the *Oeconomus* or steward of a Church, and dispense her revenue if the *Bishop* command him. 4. He may undertake the patronage, or assistance of any distressed person that

Can. 14.

Epist. 66.

needs the Churches ayde. * From hence it is evident that all secular imployment did not *hoc ipso* avocate a Clergy man from his necessary office and duty; for some secular imployments are permitted him, *all causes of piety, of charity, all occurrences concerning the revenues of the Church, and not hing for covetousnesse, but any thing in obedience,* any thing I meane of the fore-named instances. Nay the affaires of Church revenues, and dispensation of Ecclesiasticall Patrimony was imposed on the *Bishop* by the *Canons Apostolicall*, and then considering how many possessions were deposited first at the Apostles feet, and afterwards in the Bishops hands, we may quickly perceive that a case may occurre in which something else may be done by the Bishop and his Clergy besides prayer and preaching. ἀ χῆρα μὴ ἀμελεῖσθαι. μᾶ τὸ κύριον σὺ ἀνθρ θεραπεύσης ἐκ. saith *Ignatius* to S. *Polycarpe of Smyrna. Let not the Widdowes be neglected: after God, doe thou take care of them.* * *Qui locupletes sunt, & volunt, pro arbitrio quisq; suo quod libitum est contribuit; & quod collectum est apud Præsidem deponitur, atq; is inde opitulatur Orphanis, & viduis, iisq; qui vel morbo, vel aliâ de causâ egent: tum iis qui vincti sunt, & peregrè advenientibus hospitibus: & ut uno verbo dicam, omnium indigentium Curator est. All the Collects and Offerings of faithfull people are deposited with the Bishop, and thence he dispenses for the reliefe of the widdowes, and Orphans, thence he provides for travellers, and in one word, he takes care of all indigent, and necessitous people.* So it was in *Justin Martyrs* time and

Vide Synod. Roman. sub Sylvestr. c. 4. Concil. Chalced. c. 26. & Zonar. ibid.

Justin. Martyr. Apolog. 2.

and all this, a man would think, requir'd a considerable portion of his time, besides his studies and prayer and preaching.

This was also done even in the *Apostles* times, for first they had the provision of all the Goods, and persons of the *cœnobium*, of the Church at *Ierusalem*. This they themselves administred till a complaint arose, which might have prov'd a Scandall; then they chose seven men, men full of the holy Ghost, men that were Priests, for they were of the 70 *Disciples* saith *Epiphanius*, and such men as Preached, and Baptized, so S. *Stephen*, and S. *Philip*, therefore to be sure they were Clergy-men, and yet they left their preaching for a time, at least abated of the height of the imployment, for therefore the Apostles appointed them, that themselves might not leave the word of God and serve Tables; plainly implying that such men who were to serve these Tables, must leave the Ministery of the word, in some sense or degree, and yet they chose Presbyters, and no harme neither, and for a while themselves had the imployment. I say there was no harme done, by this temporary office, to their Priestly function and imployment. For to me it is considerable. If the calling of a Presbyter does not take up the whole man, then what inconvenience though his imployment be mixt with secular allay. But if it does take up the whole man, then it is not safe for any Presbyter ever to become a *Bishop*, which is a dignity of a farre greater burden, and requires more then a Man's all, if all was requir'd to

the function of a Presbyter. But I proceed.

4. The Church prohibiting secular imployment to Bishops and Clerks, doe prohibite it, onely *in gradu impedimenti officii Clericalis*; and therefore when the offices are supplyed by any of the Order, it is never prohibited but that the personall abilities of any man may be imployed for the faireſt advantages either of Church, or Common-wealth. And therefore it is obſerveable that the Canons provide that the Church be not deſtitute, not that ſuch a particular Clerke ſhould there officiate. Thus the Councell of *Arles* decreed, *ut Presbyteri* SICUT HACTENUS FACTUM EST, INDISCRETE *per diversa non mittantur loca .... ne fortè propter eorum abſentiam, & animarum pericula, & Eccleſiarum in quibus conſtituti ſunt, negligantur officia.* So that here we ſee, 1. That it had been uſuall to ſend Prieſts on Embaſſyes [*ſicut hactenus factum eſt*] 2. The Canon forbids the *indiſcreet* or *promiſcuous* doing of it; not that men of great ability & choyce be not imployed, but that there be diſcretion, or diſcerning in the choyce of the men. *viz.* that ſuch men be choſen whoſe particular worth did by advancing the legation, make compenſation for abſence from their Churches; and then I am ſure there was no indiſcretion in the Embaſſy, *quoad hoc* at leaſt; for the ordinary offices of the Church might be diſpenſed by men of even abilities, but the extraordinary affaires of both ſtates require men of an heightned apprehenſion. 3. The Canon only took care that the cure of the ſoules of a Pariſh be not relinqui-

Apud Burchard. lib. 2. decret. cap. 99.

linquished, for so is the title of the *Canon*, *Ne Presbyteri causâ legationis per diversa mittantur loca, curâ animarum relictâ.* But then if the cure be supplied by delegation, the feares of the Canon are prevented.

* In pursuance of this consideration the Church forbad Clergy-men to receive honour, or secular preferment; and so it is expressed where the prohibition is made. It is in the Councell of *Chalcedon.* *Qui semel in clero deputati sunt, aut Monachorum vitam expetiverunt, statuimus neq; ad militiam, neq; ad dignitatem aliquam venire mundanam.* That's the inhibition; But the Canon subjoynes a temper; *aut hoc tentantes, & non agentes pœnitentiam, quo minùs redeant ad hoc quod propter Deum primitùs elegerunt, anathematizari*, they must not turne *Souldiers*, *or enter upon any worldy dignity to make them leave their function, which for the honour of God they have first chosen*: for then, it seemes, he that tooke on him military honours, or secular prefectures, or consular dignity, could not officiate in holy Orders, but must renounce them to assume the other; It was in obstruction of this abuse that the Canon directed its prohibition, *viz.* in this sence clearely, that a Clerk must not so take on him secular offices, as to make him *redire in sæculum*, having put his hand to the plow, to look back, to change his profession, or to relinquish the Church, and make her become a Widdow. The case of S. *Matthew* and S. *Peter*, distinguish, and cleare this businesse. *Ecce reliquimus omnia*, was the profession of their Clericall office.

Part. 2. Act. 15. Can. 7.

S. *Mat-*

S. *Matthew* could not returne to his trade of Publican at all, for that would have taken him from his Apostolate. But S. *Peter* might and did returne to his nets, for all his *reliqui omnia*. Plainly telling us that a SECULAR CALLING, a CONTINUED FIX'D ATTENDANCE on a businesse of the world is an impediment to the Clericall office, and ministration, but not a temporary employment or secession.

5. The Canons of the Church doe as much forbid the cares of household, as the cares of publike imployment to Bishops. So the fourth Councell of *Carthage* decrees. *Vt Episcopus nullam rei familiaris curam ad se revocet, sed lectioni, & orationi, & verbi Dei prædicationi tantummodò vacet.* Now if this Canon be confronted with that saying of S. *Paul* [*He that provides not for them of his own household is worse then an infidell*] it will easily informe us of the Churches intention. For they must provide, saith S. *Paul*, But yet so provide as not to hinder their imployment, or else they transgresse the Canon of the Councell; but this caveat may be as well entred, and observed in things Politicall, as Oeconomicall.

Can. 20.

Thus farre we have seene what the Church hath done in pursuance of her owne interest, and that was that she might with sanctity, and without distraction, tend her Grand imployment; but yet many cases did occurre in which she did canonically permitt an alienation of imployment, and revocation of some persons from an assiduity of Ecclesiasticall

astical attendance, as in the case of the seven set over the widdowes, and of S. *Peter*, and S. *Paul*, and all the *Apostles* and the *Canon of Chalcedon*.

Now let us see how the Common-wealth also pursued her interest, and because shee found *Bishops* men of Religion and great trust, and confident abilities, there was no reason that the Common-wealth should be differv'd in the promotion of able men to a *Bishops throne*. * Who would have made recompence to the Emperour for depriving him of *Ambrose* his prefect, if Episcopall promotion had made him incapable of serving his Prince in any great Negotiation? It was a remarkeable passage in *Ignatius*, ὁ ἂν ὁπίσκοπον .... ὡς αὐτὸν ὁ Κύριον δεῖ προσβλέπειν, τὸν κύριον προσήκων. ὁρᾷ πκον ὃ αὐδρα καὶ ὄξω τοῖς ἔργοις βασιλεῦσι δεῖ παρεσάναι, καὶ μὴ παρεσάναι ἀνθρώποις νωθροῖς. *As our Lord is to be observ'd so also must we observe the* BISHOP, *because he assists and serves the Lord. And wise men, and of great Vnderstanding must* SERVE KINGS, *for he must not be serv'd with men of small parts.* Here either *Ignatius* commends Bishops to the service of Kings, or else propounds them as the fittest men in the world to doe them service. For if onely men of great abilities are fit to serve Kings, surely as great abilities are required to inable a man for the service of God in so peculiar manner of approximation. He then that is fit to be a *Bishop*, is most certainly fit for the service of his King. This is the sence of *Ignatius* his discourse. Epist. ad Ephes.

For consider. Christianity might be suspected for a designe; and if the Church should choose the best,

best, and most pregnant Understandings for her imployment, and then these men become incapable of aydeing the Republike, the promotion of these men, would be an injury to those Princes whose affayres would need support. * The interest of the Subjects also is considerable. For we find by experience, that no authority is so full of regiment, and will so finely force obedience, as that which is seated in the Conscience; And therefore *Numa Pompilius* made his lawes, and imposed them with a face of religious solemnity. For the people are stronger then any one Governour, and were they not awed by Religion, would quickly *miscere Sacra prophanis*, jumble heaven and earth into a miscellany, and therefore not onely in the Sanction of lawes, but in the execution of them, the *Antistites religionis* are the most competent instruments; and this was not onely in all religions that ever were, and in ours ever till now, but even now we should quickly find it, were but our *Bishops* in that Veneration, and esteeme that by the law of God they ought, and that actually they were in the Calenture of primitive devotion, and that the Doctors of Religion were ever even amongst the most barbarous and untaught Pagans.

Upon the confidence of these advantages, both the Emperours themselves when they first became Christian allowed appeales from secular tribunalls to the * *Bishops* Consistory, even in causes of secular interest, and the people would choose to have their difficulties there ended whence they expected

Sozom. lib. 1. cap. 9.

the

the issues of justice, and religion. * I say this was done as soone as ever the Emperours were Christian. Before this time, *Bishops*, and Priests (to be sure) could not be imployed in state affayres, they were odious for their Christianity; and then no wonder if the Church forbad secular imployment in meaner offices, the attendance on which could by no meanes make recompense for the least avocation of them from their Church imployment. So that it was not onely the avocation but the sordidnesse of the imployment that was prohibited the Clergy in the Constitutions of holy Church. But as soone as ever their imployment might be such as to make compensation for a temporary secession, neither Church nor State did then prohibite it; And that was as soone as ever the Princes were Christian, for then immediately the *Bishops* were imployed in honorary negotiations. It was evident in the case of S. *Ambrose*. For the Church of *Millaine* had him for their *Bishop*, and the Emperour had him one of his prefects, and the people their judge in causes of secular cognisance. For when he was chosen Bishop the Emperour who was present at the election cryed out, *Gratias tibi ago Domine .... quoniam huic viro ego quidem commisi corpora; tu autem animas, & meam electionem ostendisti tuæ justitiæ convenire.* So that he was *Bishop*, and *Governour of Millaine* at the same time; And therefore by reason of both these offices S. *Austin* was forc'd to attend a good while before he could find him at leisure. *Non enim quærere ab eo poteram quod volebam sicut volebam,* Tripart. hist. lib. 7. cap. 8. S. August. lib. 6. Confess. cap. 4.

secludentibus me ab ejus aure, atq; ob catervis negotiosorum hominum, quorum infirmitatibus serviebat. And it was his owne condition too, when he
Epist. 110. came to sit in the chayre of *Hippo*, *Non permittor ad quod volo vacare ante meridiem; post meridiem occupationibus hominum teneor.* And againe, *& homines quidam causas suas sæculares apud nos finire*
Epist. 147. *cupientes, quando eis necessarij fuerimus, sic nos Sanctos, & Dei servos appellant, ut negotia terræ suæ peragant. Aliquando & agamus negotium salutis nostræ & salutis ipsorum, non de auro, nec de argento non de fundis, & pecoribus, pro quibus rebus quotidiè submisso capite salutamur ut dissensiones hominum terminemus.* It was almost the businesse of every day to him, to judge causes concerning Gold, and Silver, Cattell, and glebe, and all appertenances of this life. This S. *Austin* would not have done, if it had not been lawfull, so we are to suppose in charity;
de opere Monach. cap: 29. but yet this we are sure of, *S. Austin* thought it not only lawfull, but a part of his duty, [*quibus nos molestijs idem affixit Apostolus*, and that by the authority, not of himselfe, but of him that spake within him, even the H. Ghost:] so he.

Thus also it was usuall for Princes in the Primitive Church to send *Bishops* their Embassadours. *Constans* the Emperour sent two *Bishops* chosen out
Tripart. hist: lib: 4. cap. 25. of the Councell of *Sardis* together with *Salianus* the Great Master of his Army to *Constantius* * S.
lib: 10. cap: 6. ibid. *Chrysostom* was sent Embassadour to *Gainas*. *Maruthus* the *Bishop* of *Mesopotamia* was sent Embas-
lib. 11. cap. 8. ibid. sadour from the Emperour to *Isdigerdes* the King

of

of *Persia*. S. *Ambrose* from *Valentinian* the yonger to the Tyrant *Maximus*. * *Dorotheus* was a Bishop and a chamberlaine to the *Emperour*. Many more examples there are of the concurrence of the Episcopall office, and a secular dignity or imployment. Now then Consider. * The Church did not, might not challenge any secular honour, or imployment by vertue of her Ecclesiasticall dignity precisely. 2. The Church might not be ambitious, or indagative of such imployment. 3. The Church-e's interest abstractly considered was not promoted by such imployment, but where there was no greater way of compensation was interrupted and depress'd. 4. The Church (though in some cases shee was allowed to make secession, yet) might not relinquish her owne charge, to intervene in anothers ayd. 5. The Church did by no meanes suffer her Clerks, to undertake any low secular imployment, much more did shee forbid all sordid ends, and Covetous designes. 6. The Bishop, or his Clerks might ever do any action of piety, though of secular burden. Clerks were never forbidden to reade Grammer, or Philosophy to youth, to be Masters of Schooles, of Hospitalls, they might reconcile their Neighbours that were falne out, about a personall trespasse, or reall action, and yet since now adayes a Clergy-man's imployment and capacity is bounded within his Pulpit, or reading deske, or his study of Divinity at most, these that I have reckoned are as verily secular as any thing, and yet no law of Christendome ever prohibited any of these

lib. 5. Epist. Ambros. 33. Euseb: lib. 8. cap. 1.

or any of the like Nature to the Clergy, nor any thing that is ingenuous, that is fit for a Scholler, that requires either fineneſſe of parts, or great learning, or overruling authority, or exemplary piety. 7. Clergy-men might do any thing that was impoſed on them by their Superiours. 8. The Biſhops, and Prieſts were men of Great ability and ſureſt confidence for determinations of Iuſtice, in which, religion was ever the ſtrongeſt binder. And therefore the Princes and People ſometimes forc'd the Biſhops from their owne intereſt to ſerve the Common-wealth, & in it they ſerv'd themſelves directly, and by conſequence too, the Church had not only a ſuſtentation from the ſecular arme, but an addition of honour, and ſecular advantages, and all this warranted by precedent of Scripture, and the practice of the Primitive Church, and particularly of men whom all ſucceeding ages have put into the Calender of Saints. * So that it would be conſidered, that all this while, it is the kings intereſt, and the Peoples that is pleaded, when we aſſert a capacity to the *Biſhops* to undertake charges of publike truſt. It is no addition to the calling of *Biſhops*. It ſerves the *King*, it aſſiſts the republike, and in ſuch a plethory, and almoſt a ſurfet of Clergy-men as this age is ſupplied with, it can be no diſſervice to the Church, whoſe dayly offices may be plentifully ſupplyed by Vicars, and for the temporary avocation of ſome few, aboundant recompence is made to the Church (which is not at all injured) by becomming an occaſion of indearing the Church, to thoſe whoſe aide ſhee is.

* There

* There is an admirable epistle written by *Petrus Blesensis* in the name of the *Arch-bishop of Canterbury* to *P. Alexander* the third in the defence of the *Bishop of Ely*, *Wincheſter* & *Norwich* that attended the Court upon service of the *King*. *Non est novum* (saith he) *quòd Regum Consiliis intersint Episcopi. Sicut enim honestate, & sapientiâ cæteros antecedunt, sic expeditiores, & efficaciores in reip. administratione censentur. Quia sicut Scriptum est* [*minùs salubriter disponitur regnum, quod non regitur consilio sapientum*] *In quo notatur eos consiliis Regum debere assistere, qui sciant & velint, & possint patientibus compati, paci terræ, ac populi saluti prospicere, erudire ad justitiam Reges, imminentibus occurſare periculis, vitæq. maturioris exemplis informare subditos & quâdam authoritate potestativâ præsumptionem malignantium cohibere.* It is no new thing for Bishops to be Counsellors to Princes (saith he) their wisdome and piety that enables them for a Bishoprick proclaimes them fit instruments to promote the publike tranquillity of the Common-wealth. They know how to comply with oppressed people, to advance designes of peace, and publike security; It is their office to instruct the King to righteousnesse, by their sanctity to be a rule to the Court, and to diffuse their exemplary piety over the body of the Kingdome, to mixe influences of religion with designes of state, to make them have as much of the dove as of the serpent, and by the advantage of their religious authority to restraine the malignity of accursed people in whom any image of a God, or Epist. 84.

of

of religion is remaining. * He proceeds in the discourse and brings the examples of *Samuel, Isaiah, Elisha, Iojada, Zecharias*, who were Priests and Prophets respectively, and yet imployed in Princes Courts, and Councells of Kings, and addes this; *Vnum noveritis, quia nisi familiares, & Consiliarii Regis essent Episcopi, suprà dorsum Ecclesiæ hodiè fabricarent peccatores, & immanitèr, ac intolerabiliter opprimeret Clerum præsumptio Laicalis.* That's most true. If the Church had not the advantage of additionall honorary imployments, *the plowers would plow upon the Churches back, & make long furrowes.* * The whole Epistle is worth transcribing, But I shall content my selfe with this summary of the advantages which are acquir'd both to policy and Religion by the imployment of Bishops in Princes Courts. *Istis me diantibus mansuescit circa simplices judiciarius rigor, admittitur clamor pauperum, Ecclesiarum dignitas erigitur, relevatur pauperum indigentia, firmatur in clero libertas, pax in populis, in Monasteriis quies, justitia liberè exercetur, superbia opprimitur, augetur Laicorum devotio, religio fovetur, diriguntur judicia, &c.* When pious Bishops are imployed in Princes Councells, *then the rigor of Lawes is abated, equity introduced, the cry of the poore is heard, their necessities are made known, the liberties of the Church are conserved, the peace of Kingdomes labour'd for, pride is depressed, religion increaseth, the devotion of the Laity multiplies, and tribunalls are made just, and incorrupt, and mercifull.* Thus farre *Petrus Blesensis.* * These are the effects which

which though perhaps they doe not alwaies fall out, yet these things may in expectation of reason be look'd for from the Clergy, their principles and calling promises all this, *& quia in Ecclesiâ magis lex est, ubi Dominus legis timetur, meliùs dicit apud Dei Ministros agere causam. Facilius enim Dei timore sententiam legis veram promunt*; (saith S. *Ambrose*,) and therefore certainly the fairest reason in the world that they be imployed. But if personall defaillance be thought reasonable to dismploy the whole calling, then neither Clergy nor Laity should ever serve a Prince. In 1. Corinth. 6.

And now we are easily driven into an understanding of that saying of S. *Paul* [*No man that warreth entangleth himselfe with the affaires of this life.*] For although this be spoken of all Christian people, and concernes the Laity in their proportion as much as the Clergy, yet nor one, nor the other is interdicted any thing that is not a direct hinderance to their owne precise duty of Christianity. And such things must be par'd away from the fringes of the Laity, as well as the long robe of the Clergy. But if we should consider how little we have now left for the imployment of a *Bishop*, I am afraid a *Bishop* would scarce seem to be a necessary function, so farre would it be from being hindered by the collaterall intervening of a Lay-judicature. I need not instance in any particulars; for if the judging matters and questions of religion be not left alone to them, they may well be put into a tem- 2. Timoth. 2. 4.

porall imployment, to preserve them from suspition of doing nothing.

I have now done with this; only intreating this to be considered. Is not the King *fons utriusq; jurisdictionis?* In all the senses of Common-law, and externall compulsory he is. But if so, then why may not the King as well make *Clergy-Iudges*, as *Lay-Delegates?* For (to be sure) if there be an incapacity in the Clergy of medling with secular affaires, there is the same at least in the Laity of medling with Church affaires. For if the Clergy be above the affaires of the World, then the Laity are under the affaires of the Church: or else, if the Clergy be incapable of Lay-busmesse, because it is of a different and disparate nature from the Church, does not the same argument exclude the Laity from intervening in Church affaires? For the Church differs no more from the common-wealth, then the common-wealth differs from the Church. And now after all this, suppose a King should command a *Bishop* to goe on Embassy to a forraine Prince, *to be a Commissioner in a treaty of pacification*, if the *Bishop* refuse, did he doe the duty of a Subject? If yea, I wonder what subjection that is which a *Bishop* owes to his Prince, when hee shall not be bound to obey him in any thing but the saying, and doing of his office, to which he is obliged, whether the Prince commands him yea or no. But if no, then the Bishop was tyed to goe, and then the calling makes him no way incapable of such imployment, for no man can be bound to doe a sinne.

But

§. 50. And therefore were inforced to delegate their power and put others in substitution.

BUt then did not this imployment, when the occasions were great, and extraordinary, force the *Bishops* to a temporary absence? And what remedy was there for that? For the Church is not to be left destitute, that's agreed on by all the *Canons*. They must not be like the *Sicilian Bishops* whom *Petrus Blesensis* complains of, that attended the Court, and never visited their Churches, or took care either of the cure of soules, or of the Church possessions. What then must be done? The *Bishops* in such cases may give delegation of their power, and offices to others, though now adaies they are complain'd of for their care. I say, for their care; For if they may intervene in secular affaires, they may sometimes be absent, and then they must delegate their power, or leave the Church without a Curate. *** But for this matter the account need not be long. For since I have proved that the whole Dioceſſe is *in curâ Episcopali*, and for all of it, he is responsive to God Almighty, and yet, that instant necessity and the publike act of Christendome hath ratified it, that Bishops have delegated to Presbyters so many parts of the Bishops charge as there are parishes in his Dioceſſe, the ἀυθεντία which is pretended for delegation of Episcopall charge, is no lesse then the act of all Christendome. For it is evident at first, Presbyters had no distinct cure at all, but were in common assistant to the *Bishop*, and were his emissaries for the gaining soules in Citty, or Suburbs; But when the *Bishops* divided parishes, and fixt the

Presbyters upon a cure, so many Parishes as they distinguished, so many delegations they made; And these we all believe to be good both in law, and conscience. For the *Bishop per omnes divinos ordines propriæ hierarchiæ exercet mysteria* (saith S. *Denis*,) he does not doe the offices of his order by himselfe onely, but by others also, for all the inferior orders doe so operate, as by them he does his proper offices.

Eccles. hierar. 6.5.

* But besides this grand act of the *Bishops* first, and then of all Christendome in consent, we have faire precedent in S. *Paul*; for he made delegation of a power to the Church of *Corinth* to excommunicate the incestuous person. It was a plain delegation; for he commanded them to doe it, and gave them his *own spirit*, that is, his *own authority*; and indeed without it, I scarce find how the delinquent should have been delivered over to Satan in the sense of the *Apostolick* Church, that is, *to be buffeted*, for that was a miraculous appendix of power Apostolick.

* When S. *Paul* sent for *Timothy* from *Ephesus*, he sent *Tychicus* to be his *Vicar*. [*Doe thy diligence to come unto me shortly, for Demas hath forsaken me &c. And Tychicus have I sent to Ephesus*] Here was an expresse delegation of the power of jurisdiction to *Tychicus*, who for the time was *Curate to S. Timothy*. *Epaphroditus* for a while attended on S. *Paul*, although he was then *Bishop* of *Philippi*, and either S. *Paul*, or *Epaphroditus* appointed one in substitution, or the Church was relinquished, for

2. *Timoth.* 4. v. 9. & 12.

Philip. 2. v. 25. 26.

for he was most certainly non-resident.

* Thus also we find that *S. Ignatius* did delegate his power to the Presbyters in his voyage to his *Martyrdome. Presbyteri pascite gregem qui inter vos est, donec Deus designaverit eum qui principatum in vobis habiturus est. Ye Presbyters doe you feed the flock till God shall designe you a Bishop. Till then.* Therefore it was but a delegate power, it could not else have expired in the presence of a Superiour. * To this purpose is that of the *Laodicean Councell. Non oportet Presbyteros ante ingressum Episcopi ingredi, & sedere in tribunalibus, nisi fortè aut ægrotet Episcopus, aut in peregrinis eum esse constiterit. Presbyters must not sit in Consistory without the Bishop, unlesse the Bishop be sick, or absent.* So that it seemes what the Bishop does when he is in his Church, that may be committed to others in his absence. And to this purpose S. *Cyprian* sent a playne commission to his Presbyters. *Fretus ergo dilectione & religione vestrâ .... his literis hortor, & Mando vt vos ....* VICE MEA FUNGAMINI *circa gerenda ea quæ administratio religiosa deposcit. I intreat and command you, that you doe my office in the administration of the affayres of the Church*; and another time he put *Herculanus*, and *Caldonius*, two of his Suffragans, together with *Rogatianus*, and *Numidicus*, two Priests, in substitution for the excommunicating *Felicissimus* and fower more. [*Cùm ego vos pro me* VICARIOS *miserim.*] So it was just in the case of *Hierocles Bishop* of *Alexandria* and *Melitius* his Surrogate in *Epiphanius. Videbatur autem*

Epist. ad Antioch.

Can. 56.

Epist. 9.

Epist. 38. & 39.

hæres. 68.

autem & Melitius præminere &c: *vt qui secundum locum habebat post Petrum in Archiepiscopatu, velut adjuvandi ejus gratiâ sub ipso existens, & sub ipso Ecclesiastica curans. He did Church offices under, and for Hierocles*; And I could never find any Canon or personall declamatory clause in any Councell, or Primitive Father against a *Bishop's* giving more or lesse of his jurisdiction by way of delegation.

* Hitherto also may be referr'd, that when the goods of all the Church which then were of a perplexe and busy dispensation, were all in the *Bishops* hand as part of the Episcopall function, yet that part of the *Bishops* office, the *Bishop* by order of the Councell of *Chalcedon* might delegate to a steward; provided he were a Clergy-man; and upon this intimation and decree of *Chalcedon* the Fathers in the Councell of *Sevill* forbid any lay-men to be stewards for the Church. *Elegimus vt vnusquisq; nostrûm secundùm Chalcedonensium Patrum decretu ex proprio Clero Oeconomum sibi constituat.* But the reason extends the Canon further. *Indecorum est enim laicum* VICARIUM *esse Episcopi, & Sæculares in Ecclesiâ judicare.* VICARS OF BISHOPS the Canon allowes, onely forbids lay-men to be Vicars. *In uno enim eodemq; officio non decet dispar professio, quod etiam in divinâ lege prohibetur*, &c: *In one and the same office the law of God forbids to joyne men of disparate capacities.* This then would be considered. For the Canon pretends Scripture, Precepts of Fathers, and Tradition of antiquity for it's Sanction.

Concil. Hispal. cap. 6.

* For

* For although antiquity approves of Episcopall delegations of their power to their Vicars, yet these Vicars and delegates must be Priests at least. *Melitius* was a *Bishop*, and yet the Chancellor of *Hierocles* Patriarch of *Alexandria*, So were *Herculanus*, and *Caldonius* to *S. Cyprian*. But they never delegated to any lay-man any part of their Episcopall power precisely. Of their lay-power or the cognisance of secular causes of the people, I find one delegation made to some Gentlemen of the Laity, by *Sylvanus Bishop of Troas*, when his Clerks grew covetous, he cur'd their itch of gold, by trusting men of another profession so to shame them into justice, and contempt of money. * *Si quis autem Episcopus posthâc Ecclesiasticam rem aut* LAICALI PROCURATIONE *administrandam elegerit .... non solùm a Christo de rebus Pauperum judicatur reus, sed etiàm & Concilio manebit obnoxius. If any Bishop shall hereafter concredit any Church affayres to* LAY ADMINISTRATION, *he shall be responsive to Christ, and in danger of the Councell.* But the thing was of more ancient constitution. For in that Epistle which goes under the Name of *S. Clement*, which is most certainly very ancient whoever was the author of it, it is decreed, *Si qui ex Fratribus negotia habent inter se apud cognitores sæculi non judicentur, sed apud Presbyteros Ecclesiæ quicquid illud est dirimatur. If Christian people have causes of difference and judiciall contestation, let it be ended before the* PRIESTS. For so S. *Clement* expounds

§. 51. But they were ever Clergymen, for there never was any lay Elders in any Church office heard of in the Church. *Socrat. lib. 7. cap. 37.*

Concil. Hispal. ubi suprà.

Epist. ad Iacob. Fratr. Dom.

[*Presby-*

[*Presbyteros*] in the same Epistle, reckoning it as a part of the sacred Hierarchy. * To this or some paralell constitution *S. Hierome* relates, saying that [*Priests from the beginning were appointed judges of causes*]. He expounds his meaning to be of such *Priests* as were also *Bishops*, and they were *Iudges ab initio, from the beginning* (saith S. *Hierom*). So that this saying of the Father may no way prejudge the *Bishops* authority, but it excludes the assistance of lay-men from their Consistories. *Presybter*, and *Episcopus* was instead of one word to S. *Hierom*, but they are alwaies Clergy, with him and all men else.

de 7. Ordin. Eccles.

Epist. 13. ad Valent.

* But for the mayne Question, S. *Ambrose* did represent it to *Valentinian* the Emperour with confidence, and humility, *In causâ fidei, vel Ecclesiastici alicujus ordinis eum judicare debere, qui nec Munere impar sit, nec jure dissimilis.* The whole Epistle is admirable to this purpose, *Sacerdotes de Sacerdotibus judicare, that Clergy-men must onely judge of Clergy-causes*; and this S. *Ambrose* there call's *judicium Episcopale. The Bishops judicature. Si tractandum est, tractare in Ecclesiâ didici, quod Majores fecerunt mei. Si conferendum de fide, Sacerdotum debet esse ista collatio, sicut factum est sub Constantino Aug. memoriæ Principe.* So that, both *matters of Faith* and of *Ecclesiasticall Order are to be handled in the Church, and that by Bishops, and that sub Imperatore, by permission and authority of the Prince.* For so it was in *Nice*, under *Constantine*. Thus farre S. *Ambrose*.

Epist. ad Solitar.

* S. *Athanasius* reports that *Hosius* Bishop of *Cordubâ*,

Corduba, president in the *Nicene* Councell, said, it was the abhomination of delolation that a *lay-man* should be *judge in Ecclesiasticis judicijs, in Church-causes*; And *Leontius* calls Church-affayres, *Res alienas à Laicis, things of another Court, of a distinct cognisance from the Laity.* Suidas in vitâ Leontij.

* To these adde the Councell of *Venice*, for it is very considerable in this Question. *Clerico nisi ex permissu Episcopi sui servorum suorum sæcularia judicia adire non liceat. Sed si fortasse Episcopi sui judicium cæperit habere suspectum, aut ipsi de proprietate aliquâ adversus ipsum Episcopum fuerit nata contentio, aliorum Episcoporum audientiam,* NON SÆCULARIUM POTESTATUM *debebit ambire. Alitèr à communione habeatur alienus. Clergy-men without delegation from their Bishop may not heare the causes of their servants, but the Bishop, unlesse the Bishop be appealed from, then other Bishops must heare the cause, but* NO LAY IUDGES *by any meanes.* Can. 9. A. D. 453.

* These Sanctions of holy Church it pleased the Emperour to ratifie by an Imperiall edict, for so *Iustinian* commanded that in causes Ecclesiasticall, *Secular Iudges* should have no interest, SED SANCTISSIMUS EPISCOPUS SECUNDUM SACRAS REGULAS CAUSÆ FINEM IMPONAT. *The Bishop according to the Sacred Canons must be the sole judge of Church-matters.* I end this with the decretall of S. *Gregory* one of the fower Doctors of the Church. *Cavendum est à Fraternitate vestrâ, ne sæcularibus viris, atq; non sub regulâ nostrâ degentibus res Ecclesiasticæ committantur. Heed must be taken that* Novell. constit. 123. lib. 7. epist. 66.

matters Ecclesiasticall be not any waies concredited to secular persons. But of this I have twice spoken already. §. 36. and §. 41.

The thing is so evident, that it is next to impudence to say that in Antiquity *Lay-men* were parties and assessors in the Consistory of the Church. It was against their faith, it was against their practice; and those few pigmy objections, out of * *Tertullian*, S. *Ambrose*, and S. *Austin* using the word *Seniores*, or *Elders*, sometimes for *Priests*, as being the latine for the Greeke πρεσβύτεροι, sometimes for a secular Magistrate, or Alderman, (for I thinke S. *Austin* did so in his third booke against *Cresconius*) are but like Sophoms to prove that two and two are not foure; for to pretend such slight, aëry imaginations, against the constant, knowne, open, Catholike practice and doctrine of the Church, and history of all ages, is as if a man should goe to fright an Imperiall army with a single bulrush. They are not worth further considering.

* *Tertull. Apol. c. 33. S. Ambros. in 1. Tim. 5. 1. & lib. 1. de offic. c. 20. S. August. lib. 3. contra Cresc. con. & Epist. 137.*

* But this is; That in this Question of *lay-Elders* the Moderne *Aërians* and *Acephali* doe wholly mistake their own advantages. For whatsoever they object out of antiquity for the white, and watry colours of lay-Elders is either a very misprision of their allegations, or else clearly abused in the use of them. For now adayes they are only us'd to exclude and drive forth *Episcopacy*, but then they misalledge antiquity, for the men with whose Heifers they would faine plough in this Question were themselves *Bishops* for the most part, and he that

was

was not, would faine have beene, it is knowne so of *Tertullian*, and therefore most certainly if they had spoken of *lay-Iudges* in Church matters (which they never dream'd of) yet meant them not so as to exclude *Episcopacy*, and if not, then the pretended allegations can doe no service in the present Question.

I am only to cleare this pretence from a place of Scripture totally misunderstood, and then it cannot have any colour from any ἀυθεντία, either divine, or humane, but that *Lay-Iudges* of causes Ecclesiasticall as they are unheard of in antiquity, so they are neither nam'd in Scripture, nor receive from thence any instructions for their deportment in their imaginary office, and therefore may be remanded to the place from whence they came, even the lake of *Gebenna*, and so to the place of the neereſt denomination. The objection is from S. *Paul*, οἱ καλῶς προεστῶτες πρεσβύτεροι &c. *let the Elders that rule well, be accounted worthy of double honour, especially they that labour in the word & doctrine. especially they*---- therefore all Elders doe not so. Here are two sorts of Elders, Preaching Ministers, and Elders not Preachers. Therefore *Lay-Elders*, and yet all are governours. 1. Tim. 5. 17.

1. But why therefore *Lay-Elders*? Why may there not be diverse Church-officers, and yet but one, or two of them the Preacher? [*Christ sent me not to Baptize but to Preach*] saith S. *Paul*, and yet the commission of [*baptizate*] was as large as [*prædicate*] and why then might not another say,

Christ sent me not to *Preach*, but to *Baptize*, that is, in S. *Pauls* sense, not so much to doe one, as to doe the other, and if he left the ordinary ministration of Baptisme, and betook himselfe to the ordinary office of Preaching, then to be sure, some Minister must be the ordinary Baptizer, and so, not the Preacher, for if he might be both ordinarily, why was not S. *Paul* both? For though their power was common to all of the same order, yet the execution and dispensation of the Ministeries was according to severall gifts, and that of Prophecy, or Preaching was not dispensed to all in so considerable a measure, but that some of them might be destin'd to the ordinary execution of other offices, and yet because the guift of Prophecy was the greatest, so also was the office, and therefore the sense of the words is this, *that all Presbyters must be honour'd, but especially they that Prophecy, doing that office with an ordinary execution and ministery.* So no Lay-Elders yet. Adde to this, that it is also plain that all the Clergy did not Preach. *Valerius Bishop of Hippo* could not well skill in the Latine tongue being a Greek borne, and yet a Godly *Bishop*, and S. *Austin* his Presbyter preach'd for him. The same case might occurre in the *Apostles* times. For then was a concurse of all Nations to the Christian *Synaxes*, especially in all great Imperiall Citties, and *Metropolitans*, as *Rome*, *Antioch*, *Ierusalem*, *Cæsarea*, and the like. Now all could not speak with tongues, neither could all Prophecy, they were particular guifts given severally, to severall men appointed

pointed to minister in Church-offices. Some Prophecyed, some interpreted; and therefore is is an ignorant fancy to think that he must needs be a Laick, whosoever in the ages *Apostolicall* was not a Preacher.

2. None of the Fathers ever expounded this place of *Lay-Elders*, so that we have a traditive interpretation of it in prejudice to the pretence of our new office.

3. The word *Presbyter* is never used in the new Testament for a *Lay-man*, if a Church officer be intended. If it be said, it is used so here, that's the question, and must not be brought to prove it selfe.

4. The *Presbyter* that is here spoken of must be maintain'd by Ecclesiasticall revenue, for so S. *Paul* expounds [*honour*] in the next verse. *Presbyters that rule well must be honoured &c. For it is written, thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the Oxe that treadeth out the corne.* But now, the Patrons of this new devise are not so greedy of their *Lay-Bishops* as to be at charges with them, they will rather let them stand alone on their own rotten leggs, and so perish, then fixe him upon this place with their hands in their purses. But it had been most fitting for them to have kept him, being he is of their own begetting.

5. This place speaks not of divers persons, but divers parts of the Pastorall office, προϊστασθαι, and κοπιᾶν ἐν λόγῳ. To rule, and to labour in the word. Just as if the expression had been *in materiâ politicâ*. All good Counsellors of State are worthy of dou-

ble honour, especially them that disregarding their own private, aime at the publike good. This implies not two sorts of Counsellors, but two parts of a Counsellors worth, and quality. Iudges that doe righteousnesse are worthy of double honour, especially if they right the cause of Orphans, and Widdowes, and yet there are no righteous judges that refuse to doe both.

6. All Ministers of H. Church did not preach, at least not frequently. The seven that were ἐπὶ τῶν χήρων τεταγμένοι, *set over the Widdowes were Presbyters*, but yet they were forced to leave the constant ministration of the word to attend that imployment, as I shewed * formerly; and thus it was in descent too, for ὁ πρεσβύτερος ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ, ὁ θεσσιμὸς, (said *Socrates*) *A Presbyter does not Preach in Alexandria, the Bishop only did it.* And then the allegation is easily understood. For labouring in the word does not signify, only making Homilies or exhortations to the people, but whether it be by word, or writing, or travelling from place to place, still, the greater the sedulity of the person is, and difficulty of the labour, the greater increment of honour is to be given him. So that here is no Lay-Elders; for all the Presbyters S. *Paul* speaks of, are to be honoured, but especially those who take extraordinary pains in propagating the Gospell. For though all preach, (suppose that) yet all doe not κοπιᾷν, take such great pains in it, as is intimated in, κοπιῶντες. For κοπιᾷν is to take bodily labour, and travaile, *usque ad lassitudinem*, (so *Budæus* renders it.)

* §. 48. *lib.* 5. *cap.* 22.

And

And so it is likely S. *Paul* here means. Honour the good Presbyters, but especially them that travell for disseminating the Gospell. And the word is often so used in Scripture. S. *Paul*, ἀλλὰ περισσότερον πάντων ἐκοπίασα. I have travelled in the word more then they all. Not that S. *Paul* preached more then all the Apostles, for most certainly, they made it their businesse as well as he. But he travelled further and more then they all for the spreading it. And thus it is said of the good Woman that travelled with the Apostles, for supply of the necessities of their diet and houshold offices, [*they laboured much in the Lord.*] κοπιᾶν is the word for them too. So it is said of *Persis*, of *Mary*, of *Tryphæna*, of *Triphosa*. And since these women were κοπιῶσαι ἐν Κυρίῳ, that travelled with the Apostolicall men and Evangelists, the men also travelled to, and preach'd, and therefore were κοπιῶντες ἐν λόγῳ, *that is travellers in the word.* [*We ought therefore to receive such*] (saith S. *Iohn*) intimating a particular reception of them, as being towards us of a peculiar merit. So that the sense of S. *Paul* may be this also, All the Rulers of the Church, that is, all *Bishops*, *Apostles*, and *Apostolick men*, *are to be honoured*, but especially them who, besides the former ruling, are also *travellers in the word*, *or Evangelists*.

Rom. 16.

1. Epist. cap. 3.

7. We are furnished with answere enough to infatuate this pretence for *Lay-Elders*, from the *common draught* of the new discipline. For they have some that *Preach only*, and some that *Rule*, *and Preach too*, and yet neither of them the *Lay-Elder*, viz. their *Pastors*, and *Doctors*.

8.

8. Since it is pretended by themselves in the Question of Episcopacy, that Presbyter, and Episcopus is all one, and this very thing confidently obtruded in defiance of Episcopacy, why may not *Presbyteri* in this place signify [*Bishops?*] And then either this must be *Lay-Bishops* as well as *Lay-Presbyters* or else this place is to none of their purposes.

9. If both these offices of RULING and PREACHING may be conjunct in one person, then there is no necessity of distinguishing the Officers by the severall imployments, since one man may doe both. But if these offices cannot be conjunct, then no *Bishops* must preach, nor no preachers be of the Consistory (take which government you list) for if they be, then the offices being united in one person, the inference of the distinct officer, the *Lay-Elder*, is impertinent. For the meaning of S. *Paul* would be nothing but this. All Church-Rulers must be honour'd, Especially for their preaching. For if the offices may be united in one person (as it is evident they may) then this may be comprehended within the other, and only be a vitall part and of peculiar excellency. And indeed so it is, according to the exposition of S. *Chrysostome, and Primasius*, τοῦτο δεῖ τὸ καλῶς προεστάναι μηδενὸς φειδεῖσθαι τῶν προβάτων κηδεμονίας ἕνεκεν. *They rule well, that spare nothing for the care of the flock.* So that this is the generall charge, and preaching is the particular. For the work in generall they are to receive double honour, but this of preaching, as then preaching was, had a parti-

particular excellency, and a plastick power to forme men into Christianity, especially it being then attested with miracles.

But the new office of a *Lay-Elder*, I confesse I cannot comprehend in any reasonable proportion, his person, his quality, his office, his authority, his subordination, his commission hath made so many divisions and new emergent Questions: and they, none of them all asserted either by Scripture or Antiquity, that if I had a mind to leave the way of God and of the Catholick Church, and runne in pursuit of this meteor, I might quickly be amused, but should find nothing certain but a certainty of being misguided. Therefore if not for conscience sake, yet for prudence, *bonum est esse hic*, it is good to remaine in the fold of Christ, under the guard, and supravision of those sheapheards Christ hath appointed, and which his sheep have alwaies followed.

For I consider this one thing to be enough to determine the Question. [*My sheep* (saith our blessed Saviour) *heare my voice, if a stranger, or a thiefe come, him they will not heare*] Clearly thus. That Christ's sheep heare not the voice of a stranger, nor will they follow him, and therefore those sheapheards whom the Church hath followed in all ages, are no strangers, but Sheapheards or Pastors of Christs appointing, or else Christ hath had no sheep; for if he hath, then Bishops are the sheapheards, for them they have ever followed. I end with that golden rule of *Vincentius Lirinensis*, *Magnoperè* *Cap. 3. adv. hæreses.*

naperè curandum est ut id teneamus, quod ubiq; quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est. Hoc est enim verè, propriéq; Catholicum. For certainly the Catholick belief of the Church against *Arius*, *Eunomius*, *Macedonius*, *Apollinaris*, and (the worst of hereticks) the *Cataphrygians* was never more truly received of all, and alwaies, and every where then is the government of the Church by *Bishops*. *Annunciare ergo Christianis Catholicis præter id quod* Cap. 14. *acceperunt, nunquam licuit, nunquam licet, nunquam licebit. It never was, is, nor ever shall be lawfull to teach Christian people any new thing then what they have received from a primitive fountain, and is descended in the stream of Catholick, uninterrupted succession.*

* I onely adde, that the Church hath insinuated it to be the duty of all good Catholike Christians to pray for *Bishops*, and as the case now stands, for Episcopacy it selfe, for there was never any Church-Liturgy but said Letanyes for their KING, and for their BISHOP.

Ἅγιος ὁ Θεός.

A SERMON PREACHED IN SAINT MARIES Church in OXFORD.

Vpon the Anniversary of the GUNPOWDER-TREASON.

By IEREMY TAYLOR, Fellow of *Allsoules Colledge in* OXFORD.

Nolite tangere Christos meos.



BIBL. CANT. ACAD.

OXFORD,
Printed by LEONARD LICHFIELD Printer to the Vniversity.
M. DC. XXXVIII.



878.47
74-2707

TO THE
MOST REVEREND
FATHER IN GOD
WILLIAM
by Divine providence
LORD ARCH-BISHOP OF
CANTERBURY His Grace,

Primate of all *England*, and Metropolitane,
CHANCELLOUR of the University of
OXFORD, and one of his MAIESTIES
most Honourable Privy Councell.

My most Honourable good LORD.

May it please your GRACE,

IT was obedience to my *Superiour* that ingaged me upon this last Anniversary commemoration of the great Goodnesse of God Almighty to our King and Country in the discouery of the most damnable

nable *Powder-Treason.* It was a blessing which no tongue could expresse, much lesse mine, which had scarce learn'd to speake, at least, was most unfit to speake in the Schooles of the Prophets. *Delicata autem est illa obedientia quæ causas quærit.* It had beene no good argument of my obedience to have disputed the inconvenience of my person, and the unaptnesse of my parts for such an imployment. I knew God, out of the mouth of Infants, could acquire his praise, and if my heart were actually as *Votive* as my tongue should have beene, it might be one of Gods *Magnalia* to perfect his owne praise out of the weaknesse and imperfection of the Organ. So as I was able, I endeavour'd to performe it, having my obedience ever ready for my excuse to men, and my willingnesse to performe my duty, for the assoylment of my selfe before God; part of which I hope was accepted, and I have no reason to thinke, that the other was not pardoned.

When I first thought of the Barbarisme

of this Treaſon, I wondred not ſo much at the thing it ſelfe as by what meanes it was poſſible for the Divell to gaine ſo ſtrong a party in mens reſolutions, as to move them to undertake a buſineſſe ſo abhorring from Chriſtianity, ſo evidently full of extreame danger to their lives, and ſo certainly to incurre the higheſt wrath of God Almighty. My thoughts were thus rude at firſt; but after a ſtrict inquiſition I fond it was apprehended as a buſineſſe (perhaps full of danger to their bodies, but) advantagious to their ſoules, conſonant to the obligation of all Chriſtians, and meritorious of an exceeding weight of Glory, for now it was come to paſſe which our dear Maſter foretold, *men ſhould kill us, and thinke they did God good ſervice in it*. I could not thinke this to be a part of any mans religion, nor doe I yet believe it. For it is ſo apparently deſtructive of our deare Maſter his Royall lawes of *Charity* & *Obedience*, that I muſt not be ſo uncharitable as to thinke they ſpeake their owne minde truly, when they profeſſe their beliefe of

the lawfullneſſe and neceſsity in ſome caſes of rebelling againſt their lawfull Prince and uſing all meanes to throw him from his kingdome, though it be by taking of his life. But it is but iuſt that they who breake the bonds of duty to their Prince, ſhould likewiſe forfeit the lawes of charity to themſelves, and if they ſay not true, yet to bee more uncharitable to their owne perſons, then I durſt be, though I had their own warrant. Briefly (Moſt R. Father) I found amongſt them of the Romish party ſuch prevailing opinions, as could not conſiſt with loyalty to their Prince, in caſe hee were not the Popes ſubiect, and theſe ſo generally believed, and ſomewhere obtruded under perill of their ſoules, that I could not but point at theſe dangerous rocks, at which I doubt not, but the loyalty of many hath ſuffered ſhipwrack, and of thouſands more might, if a higher *Starre* had not guided them better, then their owne Pilots.

I could not therefore but thinke it very likely that this Treaſon might ſpring from

the

the ſame Fountaine, and I had concluded ſo in my firſt meditations, but that I was willing to conſider, whether or no it might not bee that theſe men were rather exaſperated then perſwaded, and whether it were not that the ſeverity of our lawes againſt them might rather provoke their intemperate zeal, then religion thus move their ſetled conſcience. It was a materiall conſideration, becauſe they ever did and ſtill doe fill the world with outcries againſt our lawes for making a rape upon their conſciences, have printed Catalogues of their Engliſh Martyrs, drawn Schemes of moſt ſtrange tortures impoſed on their Prieſts, ſuch as were unimaginable, by *Nero*, or *Diocleſian*, or any of the worſt and cruelleſt enemies of Chriſtianity, endeavouring thus to make us partly guilty of our owne ruine, and ſo waſhing their hands in token of their owne innocency, even then when they were dipping them in the blood Royall, and would have emptyed the beſt veynes in the whole Kingdome to fill their *Lavatory*. But I found all theſe to be

but

but Calumnies, ſtrong accuſations upon weake preſumptions, and that the cauſe did reſt where I had begun, I meane, upon the pretence of the *Catholique cauſe*, and that the imagin'd iniquity of the Lawes of *England* could not be made a vaile to cover the deformity of their intentions, for our Lawes were juſt, Honourable, and Religious.

Concerning theſe and ſome other appendices to the buſineſſe of the day, I expreſſed ſome part of my thoughts, which because happily they were but a juſt truth, and this truth not unſeaſonable for theſe laſt times, in which (as S. Paul prophecyed) *men would be fierce, Traytors, heady, and high minded, creeping into houſes, leading ſilly women captive*, it pleaſed ſome who had power to command me, to wiſh me to a publication of theſe my ſhort and ſudden meditations, that (if it were poſſible) even this way I might expreſſe my duty to *God* and the *King*.

Being thus farre encouraged, I reſolved to goe ſomething further, even to the boldneſſe of a dedication to your *Grace*, that ſince

I had no merit of my own to move me to the confidence of a publike view, yet I might dare to venture under the protection of your *Graces* favour. But ſince my boldneſſe doth as much neede a defence, as my Sermon a Patronage, I humbly crave leave to ſay, that though it be boldneſſe, even to preſumption, yet my addreſſe to your *Grace* is not altogether unreaſonable.

For ſince all know that your *Grace* thinks not your life your owne, but when it ſpends it ſelfe in the ſervice of your *King*, oppoſing your great endeavours againſt the zelots of both ſides who labour the diſturbance of the Church and State, I could not think it ἀπροσδόκητον to preſent to your *Grace* this ſhort diſcovery of the Kings enemies, ὡς ὑπηκρίαν βασιλικὴν φιλοβασιλεῖ, and proper to your *Grace* who is ſo true, ſo zealous a lover of your Prince and Country. It was likewiſe appointed to be the publike voice of thanksgiving for your *Vniverſity* (though ſhe never ſpake weaker then by ſo meane an inſtrument) and therefore is accountable to your

Grace to whom under God and the King we owe the Blesſing and Proſperity of all our Studies. Nor yet can I chooſe but hope, that my Great Obligations to your *Grace's* Favour may plead my pardon, (ſince it is better that my Gratitude ſhould be bold, then my diffidence ingratefull) but that this is ſo farre from expreſſing the leaſt part of them, that it layes a greater bond upon me, either for a debt of delinquency in preſenting it, or of thankfulneſſe, if your *Grace* may pleaſe to pardon it.

I humbly crave your *Grace's Benediction*, pardon, and acceptance of the humbleſt duty and obſervance of

Your GRACES

moſt obſervant and obliged

CHAPLAINE

IER. TAYLOR.

A SERMON
PREACHED VPON THE Anniversary of the GUNPOWDER-TREASON.

LUK. 9. Cap. vers. 54.

But when Iames *and* Iohn *saw this, they said, Lord, wilt thou that we command fire to come from Heaven and consume them even as* Elias *did?*

I Shall not need to strain much to bring my Text and the day together, Here is fire in the text, consuming fire, like that whose *Antevorta* we doe this day commemorate. This fire called for by the Disciples of Christ: so was ours too; by Christs Disciples at least, and some of them intitled to our Great Master by the compellation of his holy name of IESUS.

I would say the paralell holds thus farre, but that the persons of my Text, however *Boanerges*, sonnes of thunder and of a reproveable spirit, yet are no way considerable in the proportion of malice with the persons of the day. For if I consider the cause that mov'd *Iames* and *John* to so inconsiderate a wrath, it beares a fair excuse: The men of *Samaria* turn'd their Lord and Master out of doores, denying to give a nights lodging to the Lord of Heaven and Earth. It would have disturbed an excellent patience to see him, whom but just before they beheld transfigured, and in a glorious Epiphany upon the Mount, to be so neglected by a company of hated *Samaritans*, as to be forc'd to keep his vigils where nothing but the welkin should have been his roofe, not any thing to shelter his precious head from the descending dew of heaven. ---*Quis talia fando Temperet*

Verse 53.

It had been the greater wonder if they had not been angry. But now if we should levell our progresse by the same line and guesse that in the present affaire there was an equall cause, because a greater fire was intended, wee shall too much betray the ingenuity of apparent truth, and the blessing of this *Anniversary*. They had not halfe such a case for an excuse to a farre greater malice; it will prove they had none at all, and therefore their malice was somuch the more malicious because causeless and totally inexcusable.

However, I shall endeavour to joyne their consi-

deration

deration in as neere a paralell as I can; which if it be not exact (as certainly it cannot, where we have already discovered so much difference in degrees of malice,) yet by laying them together we may better take their estimate, though it be only by seeing their disproportion.

The words as they lay in their own order, point out, 1. The persons that ask't the question. 2. The cause that mov'd them. 3. The person to whom they propounded it; 4. The Question it selfe. 5. And the precedent they urg'd to move a grant, drawn from a very fallible Topick, a singular Example, in a speciall and different case. The persons here were Christs Disciples; and so they are in our case, design'd to us by that glorious Sir-name of *Christianity:* they will be called Catholiques, but if our discovery perhaps rise higher, and that the See Apostolique prove sometimes guilty of so reproveable a spirit, then we are very neer to a paralell of the persons, for they were Disciples of Christ, & Apostles. 2. The cause was the denying of toleration of abode upon the grudge of an old schisme, Religion was made the instrument. That which should have taught the Apostles to be charitable, and the *Samaritans* hospitable, was made a pretence to justify the unhospitableness of the one and the uncharitableness of the other. Thus farre we are right, for the malice of this present Treason, stood upon the same base. 3. Although neither Side much doubted of the lawfulness of their proceedings; yet S. *Iames*

and S. *Iohn* were so discreet as not to think themselves infallible, therefore they ask'd their Lord: so did the persons of the day, aske the question too, but not of Christ, for he was not in all their thoughts; but yet they ask'd of Christs Delegates, who therefore should have given their answer *ex eodem tripode*, from the same spirit. They were the Fathers *Confessors* who were ask'd. 4. The question is of both sides concerning a consumptive sacrifice, the destruction of a Towne there, of a whole Kingdome here, but differing in the circumstance of place whence they would fetch their fire. The Apostles would have had it from Heaven, but these men's conversation was not there. Τὰ κάτωθεν, things from beneath, from an artificiall hell, but breath'd from the naturall and proper, were in all their thoughts. 5. The example, which is the last particular, I feare I must leave quite out, and when you have considered all, perhaps you will look for no example.

First of the persons; they were Disciples of Christ and Apostles. [*But when* Iames *and* Iohn *saw this*,] When first I considered they were Apostles, I wondered they should be so intemperatly angry, but when I perceived they were so angry, I wondred not that they sinned. Not the priviledge of an Apostolicall spirit, not the nature of Angels, not the condition of immortality can guard from the danger of sinne, but if we be overrul'd by passion, we almost subject our selves to its necessity. It was not therefore without reason altogether, that the Stoicks affirm'd

firm'd wisemen to be void of passions, for sure I am, the inordination of any passion is the first step to folly. And although of them, as of waters of a muddy residence wee may make good use, and quench our thirst, if wee doe not trouble them, yet upon any ungentle disturbance we drinke down mud in stead of a cleere streame, and the issues of sinne and sorrow, certaine consequents of temerarious or inordinate anger. And therefore when the Apostle had given us leave to *be angry*, as knowing the condition of human nature, hee quickly enters a *Caveat* that *we sinne not*; hee knew sinne was very likely to be hand-maid where *Anger* did domineer, and this was the reason why *S. Iames* and S. *Iohn* are the men here pointed at, for the Scripture notes them for *Boanerges*, sonnes of thunder, men of an angry temper, *& quid mirum est filios tonitrui fulgurâsse voluisse?* said S. *Ambrose*. But there was more in it then thus. Their spirits of themselves hot enough, yet met with their education under the Law, (whose first tradition was in fire and thunder, whose precepts were just but not so mercifull;) and this inflam'd their distemper to the height of a revenge. It is the Doctrine of S. [a]*Hierome* and [b]*Titus Bostrensis*; The Law had beene their Schoole-master, and taught them the rules of justice both Punitive and *Vindictive*: But Christ was the first that taught it to be a sinne to retaliate evill with evill, it was a Doctrine they could not read in the killing letter of the Law. There they might meete with precedents of revenge and anger of a high severity

[a] *Epist. ad Algas.*
[b] *in Lucam.*

verity, *an eye for an eye*, and *a tooth for a tooth*, and *let him be cut off from his people*: But forgiving injuries, praying for our persecutors, loving our enemies, and relieving them, were Doctrines of such high and absolute integrity, as were to be reserved for the best and most perfect *Law-giver*, the bringer of the best promises, to which the most perfect actions have the best proportion; and this was to be when *Shiloh* came. Now then the spirit of *Elias* is out of date,

-----Iam ferrea primum
Desinit, ac toto surgit Gens Aurea Mundo.

And therefore our blessed Master reproveth them of ignorance, not of the Law, but of his spirit, which had they but known or could but have guessed at the end of his comming, they had not been such *Abecedarij* in the Schoole of *Mercy*.

And now we shall not need to look farre for persons, Disciples professing at least in Christs schoole, yet as great strangers to the mercifull spirit of our Saviour, as if they had been sonnes of the Law, or foster-brothers to *Romulus* and suck't a wolfe, and they are *Romanists* too; this daies solemnity presents them to us, πηλῷ δεμαι συμφορμένῳ, & yet were that wash'd off, underneath they write *Christian* and *Iesuit*.

One would have expected that such men, set forth to the worlds acceptance with so mercifull a *cognomentum*, should have put a hand to support the ruinous fabrick of the worlds charity, and not have pulled the frame of heaven & earth about our eares.

But

But yet--*Ne credite Teucri!* Give me leave first to make an *Inquisition* after this *Antichristian pravity*, and try who is of our side, and who loves the King, by pointing at those whose Sermons doe blast *Loyalty*, breathing forth Treason, slaughters and cruelty, the greatest imaginable contrariety to the spirit and Doctrine of our *Dear Master*. So we shall quickly finde out more then a pareil for S. *Iames* and S. *Iohn* the *Boanerges* of my Text.

It is an act of faith, by faith to conquer the enemies of God and Holy Church, saith *Sanders* our Countryman. Hitherto nothing but well; If *Iames* and *Iohn* had offered to doe no more then what they could have done with *the sword of the spirit* and *the shield of Faith*, they might have beene inculpable, and so had he if hee had said no more; but the blood boyles higher, the manner spoyles all. *For it is not well done unlesse a warlike Captaine be appointed by Christs Vicar to beare a Croisade in a field of blood.* And if the other Apostles did not proceed such an angry way as *Iames* & *Iohn*, it was only discretion that detain'd them, not religion. *For so they might, and it were no way unlawfull for them to beare armes to propagate Religion, had they not wanted an opportunity*; if you believe the same author: *for fighting is proper for S. Peter and his Successors, therefore because Christ gave him Commission to feed his Lambs.* A strange reason! I had thought Christ would have his Lambes fed with the sincere milk of his word, not like to *Canibals*,

Sanderus de Clave David Lib. 2. c. 15.

Ibid. cap. 14.

---solitisq; cruentum
Lac potare Getis, & pocula tingere venis,

To mingle blood in their sacrifices (as *Herod* to the *Galilæans*) and quaffe it off for an *auspicium* to the propagation of the Christian faith. Me thinks here is already too much clashing of armour and effusion of blood for a Christian cause; but this were not altogether so unchristian-like, if the sheepe, though with blood, yet were not to be fed with the blood of their sheepheard *Cyrus*, I meane their Princes. But I finde many such *Nutritij* in the Nurseries of *Rome*, driving their Lambes from their folds unlesse they will be taught to wory the Lion.

Tyrannicè gubernans iustè acquisitum dominium non potest spoliari sine publico iudicio: Latâ verò sententiâ quisq; potest fieri executor. Potest autem à populo etiam qui iuravit ei obedientiam, si monitus non vult corrigi. Verb. Tyrannus.

Emanuel Sà, in his *Aphorismes*, affirmes it lawful to kill a King, indeed not every King, but such a one as rules with Tyranny, and not then, unlesse the Pope hath sentenc'd him to death, but then he may, though he be his lawfull Prince. Not the necessitude which the Law of nations hath put betweene Prince and people, not the obligation of the oath of Allegeance, not the Sanctions of God Almighty himselfe, must reverse the sentence against the King when once past, but any one of his subjects, of his owne sworne subjects, may kill him.

Præsertim cum in hoc opus per annos ferè quadraginta diligentissime incubuerim.

This perfidious treasonable position of *Sà*, is not a single Testimony. For 1. it slipt not from his pen by inadvertency; it was not made publique, untill after forty yeares deliberation, as himselfe testifies in his Preface. 2. After such an *avisamente* it is now the ordinary receiv'd manuall for the *Fathers Confessors* of the *Iesuits* Order. This

This Doctrine, although---*Titulo res digna sepulchri*--yet is nothing if compared with *Mariana*. For 1. he affirms the same Doctrine in substance. 2. Then he descends to the very manner of it, ordering how it may be done with the best convenience: He thinks poyson to be the best way, but yet that for the more secrecy, it be cast upon the chayres, saddles, and garments of his Prince. It was the old laudable custome of the *Moores of Spaine*. 3. Hee addes examples of the businesse, telling us that this was the device, to wit, by poyson'd boots, that old *Henry* of *Castile* was cur'd of his sickneſſe. 4. Lastly, this may be done, not only if the Pope judge the King a Tyrant (which was the utmost *Emanuel Sà* affirm'd) but it is sufficient proofe of his being a Tyrant if learned men, though but few, and those seditious too doe but murmure it, or beginne to call him so. I hope this Doctrine was long since disclaim'd by the whole Society, and condemned *adumbras Acherunticas*. Perhaps so, but yet these men who use to object to us an infinity of divisions among our selves, who boast so much of their owne Vnion and consonancy in judgment, with whom nothing is more ordinary then to maintaine some opinions quite throughout their Order (as if they were informed by some common *Intellectus agens*) should not be divided in a matter of so great moment, so much concerning the Monarchy of the *See Apostolike*, to which they are vowed leigemen. But I have greater reason to believe them Vnited in this Doctrine, then

De Rege & R. instituit. lib. 1. c. 6.

Qui est l'artifice dont ie trouue que le Roys Mores ont souuent usé. Cap. 7.

Postquam à paucis seditiosis, sed doctis cæperit Tyrannus appellari.

is the greatneſſe of this probability. For 1. There was an *Apology* printed in *Italy*, *permiſſu ſuperiorum*, in the yeare 1610. that ſayes, *They were all enemies of that holy Name of Ieſus that condemned Mariana for any ſuch Doctrine.* I underſtand not why, but ſure I am that the *Ieſuits* doe or did thinke his Doctrine innocent: for in their *Apology* put forth in the name of the whole Society againſt the accuſations of *Anticoton*, they deny that the Aſſaſine of *Henry* 4. I meane *Ravaillac*, was mov'd to kill the King by reading of *Mariana*, and are not aſhamed to wiſh that he had read him. Perhaps they meane it might have wrought the ſame effect upon him which the ſight of a drunkard did upon the youth of *Lacedæmon*, elſe I am ſure it is not very likely he ſhould have beene diſſwaded from his purpoſe by reading in *Mariana* that it was lawfull to doe what he intended. 3. I adde they not only thought it innocent, and without poſitive hurt, but good and commendable; ſo that it is apparent that it was not the opinion of *Mariana* alone, but that the *Moores of Spaine* had more diſciples then *Mariana*. 1. Hee ſayes it himſelfe, for commending the young Monke that killed *Henry* 3. he ſayes, he did it *having beene informed by ſeverall Divines that a Tyrant might lawfully be killed.* 2. The thing it ſelfe ſpeaks it, for his book was highly commended by [a] *Gretſer* & [b] *Bonarſcius* both for ſtile & matter, higher yet by *Petrus de Onna*, provinciall of *Toledo* who was ſo highly pleaſed with it, hee was ſorry hee wanted [c] leiſure to read it the ſecond and third

Quodamodo optandum eſſe ut ille Aſſaſſor Marianam legiſſet.

Cap. 6. Cum cognito à Theologis quos erat ſciſcitatus, Tyrannum jure interimi poſſe.

a *Chauueſaurus polit.*
b *Amphith. honoris lib. 1. cap. 12.*
c *Iterum & tertiò facturus ſi per otium & tempus licuiſſet.*

third time over, and with this censure prefixed was licens'd to the Presse. Further yet, for *Steven Hoyeda* Visitor of the *Iesuits* for the same Province approved it not only from his own judgment, but as being before approved by grave and learned men of the *Iesuits* Order, and so with a speciall commission from *Claudius Aquaviva* their generall, with these approbations and other solemne Priviledges it was Printed at [a] *Toledo* and [b] *Mentz*; and lastly inserted into the Catalogues of the Books of their Order by *Petrus Ribadineira*.

Vt approbatos priùs a viris Doctis & gravibus ex eodem nostro Ordine.

a By *Petrus Rhodriquez.* 1599.

b By *Balth. Lippius* 1605

What negligence is sufficient that such a Doctrine as this should passe so great supravisors, if in their hearts they disavow it? The children of this world are not such fooles in their generations. The Fathers of the Society cannot but know how apt these things of themselves are to publike mischiefe, how invidious to the Christian world, how scandalous to their Order; and yet they rather excuse then condemne *Mariana*: speaking of him at the hardest but very gently, as if his only fault had beene his speaking a truth *in tempore non opportuno*, something out of season, or as if they were forc'd to yeelde to the current of the times, and durst not professe openly of what in their hearts they were perswaded: I speak of some of them, for others you see are of the same opinion. But I would faine learne why they are so sedulous and carefull to procure the decrees of the *Rector* & *Deputies* of *Paris*, Rescripts of the Bishop, Revocation of Arrest of the Parliament which had

been againſt them, and all to acquit the Fathers of the Society from theſe ſcandalous opinions; as if theſe laborious devices could make what they have ſaid and done, to be unſpoken and undone, or could change their opinions from what indeed they are, whereas they never went *ex animo* to refute theſe Theorems, never ſpake againſt them in the reall and ſerious dialect of an adverſary, never condemned them as hereticall, but what they have done they have been ſham'd to, or forc'd upon, as *Pere Coton* by the King of France, and *Servin* to a confutation of *Mariana*, (from which he deſir'd to be excuſed, and after the Kings death, writ his declaratory letter to no purpoſe;) the *Apologiſts* of *Paris* by the outcryes of Chriſtendome againſt them; and when it is done, done ſo coldly in their reprehenſions with a greater readineſſe to excuſe all, then condemne any, I ſay theſe things to a conſidering man doe increaſe the ſuſpicion if at leaſt that may be called ſuſpicion for which we have had ſo plain teſtimonies of their own.

I adde this more, to put the buſineſſe paſt all queſtion, that when ſome things of this nature were objected to them by *Arnald* the French Kings Advocate, they were ſo farre from denying them or excuſing them, that they maintained them in ſpite of oppoſition, putting forth a Book intitled *Veritas defenſa contra actionem Antonii Arnaldi*. What the things were for which they ſtood upp trons, heare themſelves ſpeaking, *Tum enim id non ſolum poteſt*

Pag. 7. 1. edit.

Papa

Papa, ſed etiam debet ſe oſtendere ſuperiorem illis [*Principibus.*] *Exceptio hæc ſtomachum tibi commovet, facit ut ringaris, ſed oportet haurias, & de cætero fatearis tibi nec rationem eſſe, nec conſcientiam.* Hard words theſe! The Advocate is affirm'd to be void both of reaſon and honeſty for denying the Popes dominion over Kings. The reaſon followes, *The Pope could not keep them to their duties, unleſſe he kept them in awe with threatning them the loſſe of their Kingdomes.* But this is but the leaſt part of it. They adde, *If the ſubiects had been but diſpoſed as they ſhould have been, there was no time but it might have been profitable to have exerciſed the ſword upon the perſons of Kings.* Let them conſtrue their meaning, thoſe are their words. But ſee farther. *Pag. 67. 1. edit.*

The damned act of *Iaques Clement* the Monk upon the life of *Henry* the third of France, of *Iean Chaſtel* and *Ravaillac* upon *Henry* the fourth, are notorious in the Chriſtian world, and yet the firſt of theſe was commended by * *F. Guignard* in a diſcourſe of purpoſe, & by *Mariana* as I before cited him. The ſecond had two Apologies made for him, the one by [a] *Conſtantinus Veruna*, the [b] other without a name indeed, but with the marke and cognizance of the *Ieſuits* order, and the laſt was publiquely commended in a Sermon by a Monk of *Colein*, as it is reported by the excellent *Thuanus*.

* *Voyez le proces de Parliam. de Paris contre le pere Guignard preſtre Ieſuit.*

a *Vid. cap. 3.*

b *Lugduni de iuſta abdicatione Henr. 3. 1610.*

Not much leſſe then this is that of *Baronius*, juſt I am ſure of the ſame ſpirit with *Iames* and *Iohn*, for he calls for a ruin upon the *Venetians* for oppoſing of

of his *Holineſſe*. *Ariſe Peter, not to feed theſe wandring ſheep, but to deſtroy them, throw away thy Paſtorall ſtaffe and take thy ſword.* I confeſſe here is ſome more ingenuity, to oppoſe Murdering to Feeding then to make them all one, as *Sanders* doth, but yet the ſame fiery ſpirit inflames them both, as if all *Rome* were on fire, and would put the world in a combuſtion.

De clave David cap. 14. Vide pag. 7.

Farther yet. *Guignard* a Ieſuit of *Clermont* Colledge in *Paris* was executed by command of the Parliament for ſome concluſions he had writ which were of a high nature treaſonable, and yet as if, either there were an infallibility in every perſon of the *Society*, or as if the Parliament had done injuſtice in condemning *Guignard*, or laſtly, as if they approved his Doctrine, hee was Apologiz'd for by [a] *Lewes Richeome*, and [b] *Bonarſcius*. I know they will not ſay that every Ieſuit is infallible, they are not come to that yet, it is plain then they are of the ſame mind with *Guignard*, or elſe (which I think they dare not ſay) the Parliament was unjuſt in the condemnation of him, but if they doe, they thus proclaim their approbation of theſe Doctrines he was hanged for; for that he had ſuch, was under his own hand, by his own confeſſion, and of it ſelfe evident; as is to be ſeen in the *Arreſt* of the Parliament againſt him.

Arreſt. de Parliam. 7. de Tanv. 1595.

a *Expoſtul. Apologet. pro Societ. Ieſus.*
b *Amphith. honor. lib. 1.*

Laſtly, more pertinent to the day is the fact of *Garnet*, who becauſe a Ieſuit could have done nothing for which he ſhould not have found an Apologiſt

logist, for even for this his last act of high treason he was Apologiz'd for, by [a] *Bellarmine*, [b] *Gretser*, & [c] *Eudæmon Johannes*.

[a] *Apol. adv. R. Anglic.*
[b] *Stigm. Misteric.*
[c] *Apol. pro Garnetto.*

Thus farre we have found out persons fit enough to match any malice; *Boanerges* all, and more then a pareil for *Iames* and *Iohn:* but I shall anon discover the disease to be more *Epidemicall*, and the pest of a more *Catholike* infection, and yet if we summe up our accounts, we shall already finde the doctrine to be too *Catholike*. For we have already met with *Emanuel Sá* a Portugall, *Mariana* & *Ribadineira* Spaniards, *Bonarscius* a bas Almain, *Gretser* a German, *Eudæmon Iohannes* a false Greek, *Guignard*, *Richeome* and the *Apologists* for *Chastell*, Frenchmen, *Bellarmine* and *Baronius*, Italians, *Garnet* and *Sanders*, English.

The Doctrine you see they would fain make Catholike, now if it prove to be but Apostolique too, then we have found out an exact paralell for *Iames* and *Iohn*, great Disciples and Apostles, and whether or no the See Apostolique may not sometime be of a fiery and consuming spirit, we have so strange examples, even in our own home, that wee need seek no farther for resolution of the *Quære*. In the *Bull* of excommunication put forth by *Pius quintus* against *Q. Elizabeth* of blessed memory, there is more then a naked incouragement, as much as comes to a *Volumus & Iubemus ut adversus Elizabetham Angliæ Reginam subditi arma capessant. Bone Iesu! in quæ nos reservasti tempora?* Here is a command to turne re-

bels,

bels, a neceſſity of being Traitors. *Quid eo infelicius, cui iam eſſe malum neceſſe eſt?*

The buſineſſe is put ſomething farther home by *Catena* and *Gabutius*, who writ the life of *Pius quintus*, were reſident at *Rome*, one of them an advocate in the Roman Court; their Bookes both printed at *Rome, con licenza*, and *con privilegio*. And now hear their teſtimonies of the whole buſineſſe between the Queen and his Holineſſe.

1588. 1605.

Pius quintus publiſhed a Bull againſt Q. Elizabeth, *declared her a Heretique, and depriv'd her of her Kingdome, abſolv'd her ſubiects from their oath of Allegeance, excommunicated her, and gave power to any one to rebell againſt her &c.* This was but the firſt ſtep, he therefore thus proceeds, *He procures a gentleman of* Florence *to move her Subiects to a rebellion againſt her for her deſtruction.* Farther yet, he thought this would be ſuch a reall benefit to Chriſtendome to have her *deſtroied*, that the Pope was ready *to aid in perſon, to ſpend the whole revenew of the* See Apoſtolique, *all the Chalices and croſſes of the Church, and even his very cloths to promote ſo pious a buſineſſe as was the deſtruction of* Q. Elizabeth.

Pio publicò una bolla & ſentenza cõtra Elisabetta, dichiarandola heretica, & priva del regno, ... in tal forma concedendo che ciaſcuno andar çontra le poteſſe &c. Girolamo Catena p. 114. Il quale .... muoveſſe gli animi al ſollevamento per diſtruttione d' Elizabetta. Pag. 113. L' andare in perſona, impegnae tutte le ſoſtanze della ſede Apoſtolica, & calici, e i proprii veſtimenti. Pag. 117.

The witneſſes of truth uſually agree in one. The ſame ſtory is told by [b] *Antonius Gabutius*, and ſome more circumſtances added. Firſt he names the end of the Popes deſigne, it was *to take her life away, in caſe ſhe would not turn* Roman Catholique. *To at-*

[b] *De vitâ & Geſtis Pii 5. lib. 3. cap. 9.*

chieve

chieve this, because no Legat could come into England, nor any publique messenger from the See Apostolique *he imployed a Florentine Merchant to stirre her subiects to a rebellion for her perdition.* Nothing but *Sollevamento, Rebellion, Perdition* and *destruction* to the Queen could be thought upon by his *Holinesse.*

Qui incolarũ animos ad Elizabethæ perditionem, rebellione fatâ commoveret.

More yet; for when the Duke of *Alva* had seiz'd upon the English Merchants goods which were at *Antwerp*, the Pope took the occasion, instigated the King of *Spain* to aid *the pious attempts* of those who conspir'd against the Queen: they are the words of *Gabutius.* This rebellion was intended to be under the conduct of the *Duke* of *Norfolk, Viro Catholico,* a Roman Catholique, *Gabutius* notes it, for fear some Heretik might be suspected of the designe, and so the Catholiques loose the glory of the action. However *Pius quintus intended to use the utmost and most extreme remedies to cure her heresy, & all means to increase and strengthen the rebellion.* I durst not have thought so much of his *Holinesse*, if his own had not said it; but if this be not worse then the fiery spirit which our blessed Saviour reproved in *Iames* and *Iohn*, I know not what is.

Efflagitabat ab Rege ut Anglorum in Elizabetham pie conspirantium studia foveret.

I have nothing to doe to specify the spirit of *Paulus quintus* in the *Venetian* cause; this only, *Baronius* propounded the example of *Gregory the seaventh* to him, of which how farre short he came, the world is witnesse. Our own businesse calls to mind the *Bulls* of Pope *Clement* the eight, in which the Catholiques in England were commanded to see that

Hildebrand.

however the right of succession did intitle any man to the Crown of *England*, yet if he were not a Catholique, they should have none of him, but with all their power they should hinder his coming in. This Bull *Bellarmine* doth extreamly magnify, and indeed it was for his purpose, for it was (if not author) yet the main encourager of *Catesby* to the Powder Treason. For when *Garnet* would willingly have known the Popes minde in the businesse, *Catesby* eased him of the trouble of sending to *Rome*, since the Popes mind was cleere: I doubt not (said *Catesby*) at all of the Popes mind, but that he, who commanded our endeavours to hinder his coming in, is willing enough we should throw him out. It was but a reasonable collection.

Apol. adv. R. Angl.

Proced agt. Traytors.

I shall not need to instance in the effects which this Bull produc'd; the Treason of *Watson* & *Clerk*, two English *Seminaries* are sufficiently known, it was as a *Præludium* or warning peice to the great *Fongade*, the discharge of the Powder Treason. Briefly, the case was so, that after the Publication of the *Bull* of *Pius quintus*, these Catholiques in England durst not be good Subjects till *F. Parsons* and *Campian* got a dispensation that they might for a while doe it, and *rebus sic stantibus* with a safe conscience professe a generall obedience in causes Temporall: and after the *Bull* of *Clement* a great many of them were not good subjects, and if the rest had not taken to themselves the Priviledge which the Pope sometimes gave to the Arch-bishop of *Ravenna*, either

Innoc. Decretal de rescript cap. si quando.

ther to doe as the Pope bid them, or to pretend a reason why they would not: we may say as *Creswell* in defence of *Cardinall Allen*; *Certainly we might have had more bloudy tragedies in England, if the moderation of some more discreetly temperd had not been interposed.* However it is no thank to his *Holinesse*, his spirit blew high enough. *Philop pag. 212. a. 306.*

But I will open this secret no farther, if I may have but leave to instance once more. If I mistake not, it was *Sixtus Quintus* who sometimes pronounced a speech in full *Consistory*, in which hee compares the assasinat of *Iaques Clement* upon *Henry* the third, to the exploits of *Eleazar* & *Iudith*, where after having aggravated the faults of the murdred King, concluded him to have died impenitent, denyed him the solemnities of *Masse*, *Dirge* and *Requiem*, for his soule, at last he ends with a prayer, *that God would finish what in this (bloudy) manner had been begun.* I will not aggravate the fouleness of the thing by any circumstances (though I cannot but wonder that his *Holinesse* should say a prayer of so much abhomination,) it is of it selfe too bad. *Sep. 11. 1589*

If his *Holinesse* be wrong'd in the businesse I have no hand in it; the speech was printed at *Paris* three months after the murder of the King, and avouched for authentick by the approbation of three Doctors, *Boucher*, *Decreil*, and *Ancelein*; let them answer it, I wash my hands of the accusation, and only consider the danger of such Doctrines, if set forth with so great authority and practis'd by so uncontroulable persons. *By Nicol. Nivelle, and Rollia Thierry.*

If

If the Disciples of Christ, if Apostles, if the *See Apostolique*, if the fathers *Confessors* prove *Boutefeu's* and Incendiaries, I'le no more wonder if the people call for fire to consume us, but rather wonder if they doe not. And indeed although it be no rare or unusuall thing for a Papist to be *de facto* loyall and duteous to his Prince, yet it is a wonder that he is so since such Doctrines have beene taught by so great Masters, and at the best hee depends but upon the Popes pleasure for his Loyalty, which upon what security it rests, you may easily guesse from the antecedents.

Thus much for consideration of the persons who ask'd the Question; they were Christs Disciples, they were *Iames* and *Iohn*.

But when *Iames* and *Iohn* [*saw this*] Our next inquiry shall be of the cause of this their angry Question. This we must learne from the fore-going story. Christ was going to the feast at Ierusalem, and passing through a Village of *Samaria* ask'd lodging for a night; but they perceiving that hee was a Iew would by no meanes entertaine him, as being of a different Religion. For although God appointed that all of the seed of *Iacob* should go up to *Ierusalem* to worship, ἀνερρίφη γὰρ ἐν ἑνὶ τόπῳ προσκύνησις, yet the Tribes of the separation first under *Ieroboam* worship'd in Groves and High places, and after the captivity being a mixt people, halfe Iew, halfe Gentile, procur'd a Temple to be built them by *Sanballat* their President, neare the City *Sichem* upon the mountaine

Ver. 50.

Chrysost. in hunc locum.

Iosephi antiq. Lib. 11. c. 6.

mountaine *Gerezim*, ſtiling themſelves *pertinentes ad Montem benedictum*, by alluſion to the words of God by *Moſes*, they ſhall ſtand upon the Mount *Gerezim* to bleſſe the people, and theſe upon Mount *Ebal* to curſe. And in caſe arguments ſhould faile to make this ſchiſme plauſible, they will make it good by turning their Adverſaries out of doores. They ſhall not come neere their bleſſed Mount of *Gerezim*, but faſtning an *Anathema* on them let them goe to *Ebal*, and curſe there. And now I wonder not that theſe Diſciples were very angry at them who had loſt the true Religion, and neglected the offices of humanity to them that kept it. They might goe neere now to make it a cauſe of Religion; συμβότεσον ἄνομα τῆς εὐσεβείας (as *Nazianzene* ſpeaks) might ſeem to Apologize for them, and ſo it might if it had not led them to indiſcreet and uncharitable zeale. But men care not how farre they goe if they doe but once thinke they can make God a party of their Quarrell. For when Religion which ought to be the antidote of our malice, proves its greateſt incentive, our uncharitableneſſe muſt needs runne faſter to a miſchiefe, by how much that which ſtopt it's courſe before, drives it on with the greater violence. And therefore as it is ordinary for charity to be called coldneſſe in Religion, ſo it is as ordinary for a pretence of Religion to make cold charity.

Poſſellus de linguis. lib. 1. Deut. 27.

Orat. 12.

The preſent caſe of the Diſciples and the ſame ſpirit which, for the ſame pretended cauſe, is taken up by the perſons of the day, proves all this true; with whom

whom fire and fagot is esteem'd the best argument to convince the understanding, and the *Inquisitors* of hereticall pravity, the best Doctors and subtlest Disputants, determining all with a *Viris ignem, fossa mulieribus*. For thus wee had like to have suffered, it was mistaken Religion that mov'd these Traytors to so damnable a Conspiracy, not for any defence of their owne cause, but for extirpation of ours. For else what grievances, did they groan under? *In quos eorum populum exæstuantem sollicitavimus? quibus vitæ periculum attulimus?* It was *Nazianzen's* question to the *Apostate*. Give me leave to consider it as appliable to our present case, and try if I can make a just discovery of the cause that mov'd these Traytors to so accursed a Conspiracy.

Decret. Carol. quinti, pro Flandris.

Orat 2. in Iulian.

1 Then there was no cause at all given them by us; none put to death for being a *Romin Catholique* nor any of them punish'd for his Religion.

Vid. L. Burleighs booke called Execution for Treason not religion. King Iames his declaration to all Christian Kings and Princes, and the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury his speech in Starre-chamber in Burtons case.

This hath beene the constant attestation of our Princes and State since the first Lawes made against *Recusants* & the thing it selfe will bear them record.

From *primo* of *Elizabeth* to *undecimo*, the Papists made no scruple of comming to our Churches, Recusancy was not then so much as a Chrysome, not an *Embrio*. But when *Pius quintus* sent forth his *Breves* of Excommunication and Deposition of the Queen, then first they forbore to pray with us, or to have any religious communion. This although every where knowne, yet being a matter of fact and so as likely to be denied by others as affirmed by us without

without good evidence, see it therefore affirmed expressly by an Act of Parliament in *Decimo tertio* of *Elizabeth*, which specifies this as one inconvenience and ill consequence of the *Bull*. [Whereby hath grown great disobedience and boldnesse in many, not only to withdraw and absent themselves from divine service, now most Godly set forth and used within this Realme, but also have thought themselves discharged of all obedience &c.] Not only Recusancy, but likewise disobedience, therefore both Recusancy and disobedience.

Two yeares therefore after this *Bull*, this Statute was made if it was possible to nullify the effects of it, to hinder its execution, and if it might be, by this meanes to keep them, as they had been before, in Communion with the Church of *England*, and obedience to her Majesty. This was the first Statute that concerned them in speciall, but yet their Religion was not medled with; For this Statute against execution of the Popes *Bulls* was no more thē what had been established by Act of Parliament, in the 16.h yeare of *Richard* the second, by which it was made *præmunire* to purchase *Bulls* from Rome, and the delinquents in this kinde with all their [abettors, fautors, procurators, and maintainers to be referred to the Kings Councell for farther punishment.] There was indeed this severity expressed in the Act of 13.o of the Queene, that the putting them in Execution should be Capitall; and yet this severity was no more then what was inflicted upon the Bishop of *Ely* in *Edward* the thirds time, for publishing of a

Bull againſt the Earle of *Chester* without the Kings leave, and on the Biſhop of *Carlile*, in the time of *Henry* the fourth, for the like offence. Thus farre our Lawes are innocent.

But when this Statute did not take the good effect for which it was intended, neither keeping them in their ancient Communion nor obedience, but for all this, *Mayne*, *Campian*, and many others, came as the Popes Emiſſaries for execution of the Bull, the State proceeded to a farther ſeverity, making Lawes againſt Recuſancy, againſt Seditious and Trayterous Bookes, and againſt the reſidence of Romiſh Prieſts in *England*, making the firſt fineable with a pecuniary mulct, the two later, Capitall, as being made of a Treaſonable nature. Of theſe in order.

1 The mulct which was impoſed for Recuſancy, was not foul mony, or paid for Religion; and that for theſe reaſons. 1. Becauſe it is plaine Religion did not make them abſent themſelves from our Churches, unleſſe they had changed their Religion ſince the Bull came over. For if Religion could conſiſt with their Communion with us before the Bull (as it's plain it did) then why not after the Bull, unleſſe it be part of their Religion to obey the Pope, rather then to obey God commanding us to obey our Prince? 2. Their Recuſancy was an apparent miſchiefe to our Kingdome, and it was the prevention or diverſion of this that was the only or ſpeciall end of theſe Lawes.

The miſchiefe is apparent theſe two waies. 1. Be-

cauſe

cauſe by their Recuſancy they gave atteſtation that they held the Bull to be valid; for elſe why ſhould they after the Bull deny their Communion, which before they did not? Either they muſt think the Queen for a juſt cauſe, and by a juſt power excommunicate, or why did they ſeparate from her Communion? Now if the Queen by vertue of the Bull was excommunicate, why ſhould they ſtop here? She was by the ſame depoſed, they abſolved from all Allegeance to her, and commanded to take arms againſt her. I confeſſe it is no good argument of it ſelfe, to ſay, The Pope might excommunicate the Queen, therefore depoſe her from her Kingdome; But this concludes with them ſufficiently, with whom excommunication not only drives from Spiritualls, but deprives of Temporalls, and is not to mend our lives but to take them away; I ſpeak how it is in the caſe of Princes, (and I ſhall anon prove it) for they being publike perſons from whoſe Depoſition more may be gotten, are like to ſuffer more, *ut ex tunc ipſe (Pontifex) vaſallos ab ejus fidelitate denuntiet abſolutos, & terram exponat Catholicis occupandam*, as they are taught by Pope *Innocent* the third, in the eight *Lateran* Councell: ſuch is their Excommunication for matter of Hereſy, as was this pretended in the Queenes caſe, ſo that in reſpect of them the danger was apparent.

2 It is plaine that Recuſancy and diſobedience came actually hand in hand; I ſay not that one was the iſſue of the other, but that they were coetaneous,

for the same persons that moved them to Recusancy by vertue of the Bull, moved them to the execution of it *per omnia*. Now see whither this would tend! They by Recusancy were better able to judge of their forces in *England*, and what party they were able to make for execution of the Bull; whilest by that as by a discriminative cognisance they were pointed at, as Abettors of the Catholike cause.

Thus farre they suffered not for their Religion or conscience, unlesse it were against their conscience to be good subjects, and then it was not Religion, at least not Christian, that was inconsistent with their Loyalty, & so hitherto inrespect of us, their machination was altogether causeless.

2. For the second (I mean the writing & publishing of Seditious & Trayterous Books, I shall not need to say any thing in defence of its being made Capitall, though sometimes they accuse our laws for it) for they were ever so, & of a high nature Treasonable, & the Publishers of thē by the Canons of the Church were *ipso facto* excōmunicate. This I noted, because the same censure involves more, by vertue of the same Canon: I mean, not only the seditious Libellers but inpugners of the Kings Regalties, as also the Bringers, Publishers, and Executioners of the Bull; as is to be seene in the constitution of Arch-bishop *Stephen*, in a Councell held at *Oxford*. But secondly, whether they were or were not, it matters nothing; this I suppose was no part of their Religion, therefore this might be made Treason, and yet their Religion

Apud Linwood de senten. excommunicat. Item omnes illos excommunicationis inodavus sententia qui pacem & tranquillitatem Domini Regis & Regni, iniurioſe perturbare presumunt, & qui iura Domini Regis iniuſtè detinere contendunt.

ligion and peace of conſcience undiſturbed. 3. But the next is the main outcry of all, the very *Conclamatum eſt* of the *Catholique* cauſe, if ſuffered; it was made Treaſon to be a Prieſt, or at leaſt if any of their Prieſts ſhould be found in England he ſhould be adjudged a Traytor, and theſe Lawes were not yet repealed, but then in execution.

When certaine Sycophants told *Philip* of *Macedon*, that ſome of his diſcontented Subjects called him Tyrant, his anſwer was, *Rudes ſunt Macedones, & ſcapham vocant ſcapham.* I wiſh theſe men who object this, had the ſame ingenuity, and would acknowledge that the rudeneſſe of a *Macedonian* telltroth is no apparent calumny. And truly, as the caſe then ſtood, it was no worſe. For conſider that the ſtatute againſt Prieſts was not made till ſixteen years after the Bull of *Pius quintus*, and after much evidence both by the confeſſion of ſome Prieſts themſelves, and divers Lay-perſons, that at leaſt, many of them came into England with this errand, that they might inſtigate the Queenes liege people to the Execution of it. This is very plaine in the caſe of *Mayne* the Ieſuit, and *M. Tregion* who were executed at *Launſton* for the ſame buſineſſe. 1577.

The ſtate could not certainly know what would be the iſſue, but yet could not but think it likely to produce more and worſe conſequences for the future. *Leges autẽ juſtæ in factâ conſtituuntur quia futura in incerto ſunt.* The Queen then providing for her ſafety baniſhed theſe Prieſts out of her domini- *Tacitus lib. 3. Annal.*

ons. This was all, and this done with so much lenity and moderation as if of purpose to render good for their evill; such was her innocence, and yet to provide for her safety, such was her prudence. She gave them forty daies time of preparation for their journey, impos'd no penalty for their longer stay in case that any of them were lesse healthfull, or that the winds were crosse, or that the wether serv'd not: provided that during their stay, they gave security for their due obedience to her laws, and that they should attempt nothing against her person or government, for this was all she aim'd at; but if they obeyed not the Proscriptiõ, having no just cause to the contrary, such as were expressed in the Act, then it should be adjudged their errand was not right, & therefore (not their Religion, but) their disobedience Treasonable.

This was the highest ἀκμὴ of the severity of this state against them, now first I shall briefly shew that this proscription which was the highest penalty, was for just cause as the case then stood, and deserved on their part. 2. It was but reasonable, in case they obeyed not the proscription, their stay should be made Treason. 1. Because the Priests did generally preach the Popes power either directly over temporalls, or else in order to spiritualls, of which the Pope being judge it would come to the same issue, and this was dangerous to the peace of the Kingdome, and intrenched too much upon the Regalty. In particular, the case of bringing from the See of *Rome*, and publishing of Bulls, was by the Lords of

the

the Parliament in the sixteenth year of *Richard* the second, judg'd to be [cleerely in derogation of the Kings Crown and of his Regalty, as it is well known and hath been of a long time known,] and therefore they protested [together and every one severally by himselfe, that they would be with the same Crown and Regalty in these cases specially, and in all other cases which shall be attempted against the same Crown and Regalty in all points with all their power,] I hope then if the State in the time of Queen *Elizabeth* having farre greater reason then ever, shall judge that these Bulles, the publishing of them, the Preaching of their validity, and reconciling by vertue of them her Subjects to the See of *Rome*, be derogatory to her Crown and Regalty, I see no reason She should be frighted from her just defence with the bugbear of pretended Religion, for if it was not against Religion then, why is it now? I confesse there is a reason for it, to wit, because now the Popes power is an Article of Faith (as I shall shew anon) but then it was not with them, any more then now it is with us: but whether this will convince any man of reason I leave it to himselfe to consider.

But one thing is observeable in that Act of Parliament of *Richard* the second, I meane this clause [as it is well knowne, and hath been of a long time knowne.] The Popes incroachments upon the State of *England* had been an old sore, and by its eld almost habituate; but yet it grieved them nevertheless, nor was the lesse a fever for being hecticall: but so it is that I am confident upon very good grounds, it may

be

be made as apparent as the noon Sunne, for these 600 years and upwards, that the Bishops of *Rome* have exercised so extream and continuall Tyranny and exactions in this Kingdome, that our condition was under him worse then the State of the *Athenians* under their thirty Tyrants, or then our neighbors are now under their *Belgick* Tributes. So many greivances of the people, expilations of the Church, abuses to the State, intrenchments upon the Royalties of the Crown were continued, that it was a great blessing of Almighty God, our Kingdome was delivered from them upon so easy termes, which *Grosthead* Bishop of *Lincolne* thought would never be done, but in *Ore gladii cruentandi*: and now to have all these mischiefes returne *with more strength* upon us by the attempts of these Priests, had been the highest point of indiscretion and sleepinesse. I said [*with more strength*] because what anciently at the highest was thought but a priviledge of the Church began now to be an Article of Faith, and therefore if admitted would have bound stronger and without all possibility of redresse.

And now if after all this any man should doubt of the justice of these Lawes against the Priests obtruding upon the State the Popes power, I only referre him to the Parliament of *Paris*, where let him hold his Plea against those great Sages of the Law, for their just censures upon *Florentinus Iacobus*, *Thomas Blanzius*, and *John Tunquerell*, who were all condemned to a solemne honorary penance and satis-
1561. faction

faction to the State, and not without extreme difficulty escaped death, for the same cause. But this is not all. I adde.

Secondly, the Pope had his Agent in *England* to stirre up the Subjects to rebell against the Queene, as I proved before by the testimonies of *Catena* and *Gabutius*. It is not then imaginable that he should so poorely intend his own designes, to imploy one on purpose, and he but a Merchant, and that the Priests who were the men, if any, most likely to doe the businesse, should be un-imployed. I speak not of the argument from matter of fact, (for it is apparent that they were imployed, as I shewed but now,) but it is plain also that they must have been imployed, if we had had no other argument but a presumption of the Popes ordinary discretion.

Things then remaining in this condition what security could the Queen or State have without the absence of those men who must be the instruments of their mischiefe? Thirdly, there was great reason those men might be banished who might from their own principles plead immunity from all Lawes, and subordination to the Prince. But that so these Priests might, I only bring two witnesses, leading men of their own Side. Thus *Bellarmine*: *The Pope hath exempted all Clerks from subiection to Princes* The same is taught by *Emanuel Sà* in his *Aphorismes*, *Verbo Clericus*. I must not dissemble that this Aphorisme however it passed the Presse at first, yet in the Edition of *Paris* it was left out. The cause is known to every man: For that it was meerely to serve their

Lib. 1. cap. 28. de Clericis.

ends is apparent; for their French freedome was there taken from them, they durſt not *parler tout* ſo neere the Parliament; but the Aphoriſme is to this day retain'd in the Editions of *Antwerp* and *Colein*.

If this be their Doctrine, as it is plain it is taught by theſe leading Authors, I mean *Sà* and *Bellarmine*, I know no reaſon but it may be very juſt and moſt convenient to deny thoſe men the Country from whoſe Lawes they plead exemption.

Secondly, it was but reaſonable, in caſe they obeyed not the proſcriptiõ, their diſobedience ſhould be made Capitall. For if they did not obey, then either they ſinned againſt their conſcience in diſobeying their lawfull Prince, and ſo are ἀυτοκατάκριτοι, and inexcuſable from the Lawes penalty, which may be extended at the pleaſure of the Lawgiver, where there is no poſitive injuſtice in the diſproportion; or if they did not ſinne againſt their conſcience, then of neceſſity muſt they think her to be no lawfull Prince or not their lawfull Prince, nor they her Subjects, & ſo *ipſo facto* are guilty of high Treaſon, & their execution was for *Treaſon not Religion*, and ſo the Principall is evicted which I ſhall beg leave to expreſſe in S. *Cyprians* language, *Non erat illa fidei Corona, ſed pœna perfidiæ; nec religioſæ virtutis exitus glorioſus, ſed deſperationis interitus.*

De ſimplic. Prælat.

For if *Valentius* baniſh *Euſebius* from *Samoſata*, and *Euſebius* obey not the edict, if *Valentius* puts him to death, it is not for his being a Chriſtian that he ſuffers death, but for ſtaying at *Samoſata* againſt the command of *Valentius*. Such was the caſe of the

Theodoret. l. 4. c. 14.

Prieſts

Prieſts, whom for juſt cauſe (as I have proved) and too apparent proofe of ſeditious practices the Queen baniſhed. Now if the Queen was their lawfull Soveraigne, then were they bound to obey her Decree of exile, though it had been unjuſt as was the caſe of *Euſebius*; or if they did not obey, not to think the Lawes unjuſt for puniſhing their diſobedience. I ſay again, their Diſobedience, not their Religion: for that it was not their Religion that was ſtruck at by the juſtice of theſe Lawes, but the ſecurity of the Queen and State only aim'd at, (beſides what I have already ſaid,) is apparent to the evidence of ſence. For when *Hart*, and *Boſgrave*, *Ieſuits* both, came into England againſt the Law, they were apprehended and impriſon'd: (for the Lawes without juſt Execution were of no force for the Queenes ſafety;) but when theſe men had acknowledg'd the Queenes legitimate power, and put in their ſecurity for their due obedience, they obtain'd their pardon and their liberty. The ſame proceedings were in the caſe of *Horton* and *Riſhton*, all which I hope were not Apoſtates from their Order or Religion, but ſo they muſt have been or not have eſcap'd death, in caſe that their Religion had been made Capitall. Laſtly, this Statute extended only to ſuch Prieſts who were made Prieſts ſince *Primo* of *Elizabeth*, & were born in *England*. It was not Treaſon for a French Prieſt to be in England, but yet ſo it muſt have been if Religion had been the thing they aim'd at. But 'tis ſo foule a Calumny, I am aſham'd to ſtand longer to confute it. The proceedings of the Church and State

of *England* were just, honourable and religious, full of mercy and discretion, and unlesse it were that as *C. Fimbria* complain'd of *Q. Scævola*, we did not open our breasts wide enough to receive the danger, there is no cause imaginable, I mean on our parts, to move them to so damned a conspiracy, or indeed to any just complaint.

Secondly, if these were not the causes (as they would faine abuse the world into a perswasion that they were,) what was? I shall tell you, if you will give me leave ἄνωθεν τῆς πηγῆς διορύττειν, to derive it from its very head, and then I will leave it to you to judge whether or no my Augury failes me.

a Nec ulla eis injuria fiet si deponantur. Lib. 5 de Rom. Pontif. cap. 7. Ex ipsa vi juris & ante omnem sententiam supremi Pastoris ac Iudicis contra ipsum prælatam. Lugduni impres. 1593. p. 106. n. 157. Amphith honor. p. 117. Sed heus Arnalde cuius institutione hausisti nullâ posse intercidere causam quæ regem cogat abire regno? Non religionis?

First, I guesse that the Traitors were encouraged and primarily mov'd to this Treason from the preuailing opinion which is most generally receiv'd on that side of the lawfulnesse of deposing Princes that are Heretieall. I say generally receiv'd, and I shall make my words good, or else the blame shall lay on themselves for deceiving me when they declare their own mindes. I instance first in the Fathers of the Society.[a] *Bellarmine* teacheth that Kings *have no wrong done them if they be deprived of their Kingdomes when they prove Heretiques*. *Creswell* in his *Philopater* goes farther, saying, *that if his Heresy be manifest he is deposed without any explicite judiciall sentence of the Pope, the Law it selfe hath passed the sentence of deposition.* And therefore

Bonarscius is very angry at *Arnald* the French Kings Advocate for affirming that Religion could be no just cause to depose a lawfull Prince, If hee had

had beene brought up in their Schooles hee might have learnt another leſſon; *papa Poteſt mutare regna & uni auferre atq; alteri conferre tanquam ſummus Princeps ſpiritualis, ſi id neceſſarium ſit ad animarum ſalutem*, ſaith *Bellarmine*. Hee gives his reaſon too, *quia alioqui poſſent mali Principes impunè fovere Hæreticos*, which is a thing not to be ſuffered by his *Holineſſe*. *Bellar. de Pont. R. l. 5. c. 6.* *Cap. 7.*

This Doctrine is not the private opinion of theſe Doctors, but *eſt certa, definita, atq; indubitata virorum clariſſimorum ſententia*, ſaith *F. Creſwell*, I ſuppoſe hee meanes in his owne Order; and yet I muſt take heed what I ſay, for *Eudæmon Iohannes* is very angry with *Sr Edward Cooke* for ſaying it is the Doctrine of the Ieſuits. Doe they then deny it? No ſurely, but *Non eſt Ieſuitarum propria*, it is not theirs alone, *ſed ut Garnettus reſpondit, totius Eccleſiæ, & quidem ab antiquiſſimis temporibus conſenſione recepta Doctrina noſtra eſt*, and there hee reckons up ſeven and twenty famous Authors of the ſame opinion. *Creſwell* in his *Philopater* ſayes as much, if not more: *Hinc etiam infert Vniverſa Theologorum & Iuriſconſultorum Eccleſiaſticorum Schola & eſt certum & de fide, quemcunq; Principem Chriſtianum ſi à religione Catholicà manifeſtè deflexerit, & alios avocare voluerit, excidere ſtatim omni poteſtate ac dignitate ex ipſâ vi juris tum Humani tum Divini.* You ſee how eaſily they ſwallow this great camell. Adde to this that *Bellarmine* himſelfe prooves that the Popes temporall power, or of diſpoſing of Princes *Vbi ſupra p. 107.* *Apol. pro Garnet. c. 3.* *Num. 258.*

of *England* were just, honourable and religious, full of mercy and discretion, and unlesse it were that as *C. Fimbria* complain'd of *Q. Scævola*, we did not open our breasts wide enough to receive the danger, there is no cause imaginable, I mean on our parts, to move them to so damned a conspiracy, or indeed to any just complaint.

Secondly, if these were not the causes (as they would faine abuse the world into a perswasion that they were,) what was? I shall tell you, if you will give me leave ἄνωθεν τὴν πήγην διορύττειν, to derive it from its very head, and then I will leave it to you to judge whether or no my Augury failes me.

[a] *Nec ulla eis injuria fiet si deponantur. Lib. 5 de Rom. Pontif. cap. 7. Ex ipsa vi juris & ante omnem sententiam supremi Pastoris ac Judicis contra ipsum prolatam. Lugduni impres. 1593. p. 106. n 157. Amphith honor. p. 117. Sed heus Arnalde à cuius institutione haufisti nullâ posse interciderе causam quæ regem cogat abire regno? Non religionis*

First, I guesse that the Traitors were encouraged and primarily mov'd to this Treason from the preuailing opinion which is most generally receiv'd on that side of the lawfulnesse of deposing Princes that are Heretical. I say generally receiv'd, and I shall make my words good, or else the blame shall lay on themselves for deceiving me when they declare their own mindes. I instance first in the Fathers of the Society. [a] *Bellarmine* teacheth that Kings *have no wrong done them if they be deprived of their Kingdomes when they prove Heretiques. Creswell* in his *Philopater* goes farther, saying, *that if his Heresy be manifest he is deposed without any explicite judiciall sentence of the Pope, the Law it selfe hath passed the sentence of deposition.* And therefore

Bonarscius is very angry at *Arnald* the French Kings Advocate for affirming that Religion could be no just cause to depose a lawfull Prince, If hee had

had beene brought up in their Schooles hee might have learnt another leſſon; *papa Poteſt mutare regna & uni auferre atq; alteri conferre tanquam ſummus Princeps ſpiritualis, ſi id neceſſarium ſit ad animarum ſalutem*, ſaith *Bellarmine*. Hee gives his reaſon too, *quia alioqui poſſent mali Principes impunè fovere Hæreticos*, which is a thing not to be ſuffered by his *Holineſſe*. *Bellar. de Pœni. R. c. 6. lib. 5.* *Cap. 7.*

This Doctrine is not the private opinion of theſe Doctors, but *eſt certa, definita, atq; indubitata virorum clariſſimorum ſententia*, ſaith *F. Creſwell*, I ſuppoſe hee meanes in his owne Order; and yet I muſt take heed what I ſay, for *Eudæmon Iohannes* is very angry with *Sr Edward Cooke* for ſaying it is the Doctrine of the Ieſuits. Doe they then deny it? No ſurely, but *Non eſt Ieſuitarum propria*, it is not theirs alone, *ſed ut Garnettus reſpondit, totius Eccleſiæ, & quidem ab antiquiſſimis temporibus conſenſione recepta Doctrina noſtra eſt*, and there hee reckons up ſeven and twenty famous Authors of the ſame opinion. *Creſwell* in his *Philopater* ſayes as much, if not more: *Hinc etiam infert Vniverſa Theologorum & Iurisconſultorum Eccleſiaſticorum Schola & eſt certum & de fide, quemcunq; Principem Chriſtianum, ſi à religione Catholicà manifeſtè deflexerit, & alios avocare voluerit, excidere ſtatim omni poteſtate ac dignitate ex ipſâ vi juris tum Humani tum Divini.* You ſee how eaſily they ſwallow this great camell. Adde to this that *Bellarmine* himſelfe prooves that the Popes temporall power, or of diſpoſing of Princes *Vbi ſupra p. 107.* *Apol. pro Garnet. c. 3. Num. 258.*

Contra Barclaium in principio ferè.

Kingdomes is a Catholique Doctrine, for hee reckons up of this opinion, one and twenty *Italians*, fourteene *French*, nine *Germans*, seven *English* and *Scotch*, nineteen *Spaniards*, & these not *è fæce plebis*, but *è primoribus*, all very famous and very leading Authors.

You see it is good Divinity amongst them, and I have made it good that it is a generall opinion received by all their Side if you will believe themselves and now let us see if it will passe for good Law as well as good Divinity.

It is not for nothing that the Church of *France* protests against some of their received Canons; if they did not I know not what would become of their Princes. Their *Lillies* may be to day, and to morrow be cast into the oven, if the Pope either call their Prince *Huguenot*, as he did *Henry* the fourth, or Tyrant as *Henry* the third, or unprofitable for the Church or Kingdome, as he did King *Childeric*, whom Pope *Zechary*, *de facto* did depose for the same cause, and inserted his act into the body of the Law as a precedent for the future, *quod etiam ex authoritate frequenti agit sancta Ecclesia*, it is impaled in a *parentheſis* in the body of the Canon, least deposition of Princes should be taken for newes. The law is cleere for matter of fact; the lawfulnesse followes.

Can. Alius. sauf. 15.q.6.

Cl. 1. in Summa 23.q.7.

[*Hæreticis licitum est auferri quæ habent,*] and this not only from a private man, but even from Princes, [*nam qui in majore dignitate, est plus punitur*] or take

take it if you please in more proper termes. [*Dominus Papa Principem sæcularem deponere potest propter hæresim*,] & so another may be chosen like the *Palatines* and *Castellans* in *Poland*, just as if the King were dead, *Nam per hæresim plusquam civiliter mortuus censetur*, saith *Simancha*, and that by vertue of a constitution of *Gregory* the ninth, by which every man is freed from all duty, homage, allegeance or subordination whatsoever due to a Heretick, whether due by a naturall, civill, or politicall right; [*aliquo pacto, aut quâcunq; firmitate vallatum.*] Et *sic nota* (saith the glosse) *quod Papa potest absolvere Lascum de iuramento fidelitatis.*

Gl. cap. Excommunicamus tit. de hæret. cit. l. 3.

Cap. 45. de pœnit.

I end those things with the attestation of *Bellarmine, Est res certa & explorata posse Pontificem maximum iustis de causis temporalibus iudicare, atq; ipsos Temporales Principes aliquando deponere.* And again that we may be sure to know of what nature this doctrine is, he repeats it; *Sic igitur de potestate in Temporalibus quod ea sit in Papa non Opinio, sed Certitudo apud Catholicos est.* And now let any man say if this be not a Catholike Doctrine, and a likely antecedent to have Treason to be its consequent.

Contra Barclaium cap. 3.

But I fixe not here, onely this, it is plain that this proposition is no friend to Loyalty; but that which followes is absolutely inconsistent with it, in case our Prince be of a different perswasion in matters of Religion. For,

2 It is not only lawfull to depose Princes that are hereticall, but it is necessary, and the Catholiks

are bound to doe it *sub mortali*. I know not whether it be so generally, I am sure it is as confidently taught as the former, and by as great Doctors.

Lib. 5. de Rom. Pont c. 7. *Ecclesia nimis graviter erraret si admitteret aliquem Regem, qui vellet impunè fovere quamlibet Sectam, & defendere hæreticos.* So *Bellarmine*. And again, *Non licet Christianis tolerare Regem hæreticum, si conetur pertrahere subditos ad suam hæresim.* But *F. Creswell* puts the businesse home to purpose, *Certè non tantum licet, sed summâ etiam iuris Divini necessitate, ac præcepto, imò conscientiæ vinculo arctissimo, & extremo animarum suarum periculo ac discrimine Christianis omnibus hoc ipsum incumbit, si præstare rem possint.* Vnder perill of their soules they must not suffer an hereticall Prince to reigne over them.

Ibid.

Philopat p. 110 n. 162.

Pag. 106. n. 857. *Possunt & debent eum arcere ex hominum Christianorum dominatu, ne alios inficiat &c.*

3 He that saith Subjects may and are bound to depose their Princes, and to drive them from all rule over Christians, if they be able, meanes something more: For what if the Prince resist? still he is bound to depose him if he be able. How if the Prince make a warre? The Catholike subject must doe his duty nevertheless, and warre too, if he be able. He that saies he may wage a warre with his Prince, I doubt not but thinks he may kill him; and if the fortune of the warre lights so upon him, the subject cannot be blamed, for doing of his duty.

It is plain that killing a Prince is a certain consequent of deposing him, unlesse the Prince be bound

in

in conſcience to think himſelfe a Heretick, when the Pope declares him ſo, and be likewiſe bound not to reſiſt, and beſides all this will performe theſe his obligations, and as certainly think himſelfe hereticall, and as really give over his Kingdome quietly, as he is bound. For in caſe any of theſe ſhould faile, there can be but very ſlender aſſurance of his life. I would be loth to obtrude upon men the odious conſequences of their opinions, or to make any thing worſe which is capable of a fairer conſtruction; but I crave pardon in this particular, the life of Princes is ſacred, and is not to be violated ſo much as in thought, or by the moſt remote conſequence of a publike doctrine: But here indeed it is ſo immediate and naturall a conſequent of the former that it muſt not be diſſembled. But what ſhall we think if even this blaſphemy be taught *in terminis*? See this too.

In the yeare 1407. when the Duke of *Orleans* had been ſlaine by *Iohn* of *Burgundy*, and the fact notorious beyond a poſſibility of concealement, he thought it his beſt way to imploy his Chaplaine to juſtify the act, pretending that *Orleans* was a Tyrant. This ſtood him in ſmall ſtead; for by the procurement of *Gerſon*, it was decreed in the Councell of *Conſtance*, that Tyranny was no ſufficient cauſe for a man to kill a Prince. But yet I finde that even this decree will not ſtand Princes in much ſtead. Firſt, becauſe the decree runnes [*ut nemo privatâ Authoritate &c.*] but if the Pope commands it, then it is *Iudicium publicum*, and ſo they are never the

more ſecure for all this. Secondly, becauſe *Mariana* tels us, that this Decree is nothing. *Namq; id decretum (Concilij Conſtantienſis) Romano Pontifici Martino quinto probatum non invenio, non Eugenio aut Succeſſoribus, quorum conſenſu Conciliorum Eccleſiaſticorum ſanctitas ſtat.* Thirdly, becauſe though the Councell had forbidden killing of Tyrannical Princes even by publique authority, though this Decree had beene confirmed by the Pope, which yet it was not, yet Princes are never the more ſecure if they be convict of Hereſy, and therefore let them but adde Hereſy to their Tyranny, and this Councell *Non obſtante* they may be killed by any man; for ſo it is determin'd in an Apology made for *Chatel*, *Licitum eſſe privatis & ſingulis Reges & Principes Hæreſeos & Tyrannidis condemnatos occidere, non obſtante Decreto Concilij Conſtantienſis*; And the Author of the Book *de juſtâ abdicatione Henrici.* 3. affirmes it not only lawfull but meritorious.

De Rg & R. inſtit. lib. 1. c. 6

Franc. Verum. Conſt. p. 2. c. 2.

How much leſſe then this is that of *Bellarmine? Si Temporalia obſint fini Spirituali, Spiritualis poteſtas poteſt & debet coercere Temporalem, omni ratione ac viâ.* If *omni ratione*, then this of killing him in caſe of neceſſity or greater convenience, muſt not be excluded. But to confeſſe the buſineſſe openly and freely; It is knowne that either the Conſent of the people, or the Sentence of the Pope, or Conſent of learned men is with them held to be a *publicum Iudicium*, and ſufficient to ſentence a Prince and convict him of Hereſy or Tyranny. That opinion which

De Pont. R. lib. 5. c. 6.

makes

makes the people Iudge is very rare amongst them but almost generally exploded, that opinion which makes the learned to be their Iudge is I thinke proper to *Mariana* or to a few more with him, but that the sentence of the Pope is a sufficient conviction of him, and a compleate Iudiciall act, is the most Catholique opinion on that Side, as I shall shew anon. Now whether the Pope, or learned men, or the people be to passe this sentence upon the Prince, it is plaine that it is an Vniversall Doctrine amongst them that after this sentence (whosoever it be) it is then without Question lawfull to kill him, and the most that ever they say is, that it is indeed not lawfull to kill a King, not lawfull for a private man, of his owne head, without the publike sentence of his Iudge, but when this Iudge (whom they affirme to be the Pope) hath passed his sentence, then they doubt not of its being lawfull. That I say true I appeale to [a] *Gregory de Valentia*, [b] *Tolet*, [c] *Bellarmine*, [d] *Suarez*, [e] *Salmeron*, [f] *Serarius*, [g] *Molina*, [h] *Emanuel Sà*, [i] *Azorius*, [k] *Martinus Delrius*, [l] *Lessius*, [m] *Gretser*, [n] *Becanus*, [o] *Sebastan Heissius*, [p] *Richeome*, [q] *Eudæmon Iohannes*, [r] *Salianus*, [s] *Filliucius*, [t] *Adam Tanner*, and their great [u] *Thomas Aquinas*.

Vide P. D. M. Image of both Churches.

All these and many more that I have seene teach the lawfulnesse of killing Kings after publike sen-

a *Tom. 3. disp. 5. q. 8. punct. 3.*
b. *In sum. l. 5 c. 6.*
c *Apolog. ad R. Ang. c. 13*
d *Defens. fidei lib. 6 c. 4.*
e *in 13 cap. ad Rom. disp. 5*
f *Quæst. p. in c. 3. Iud.*
g *De iust. & iure. to m. 4. tr. 3 d. 6.*
h *Aphoris. verb. Tyrannus. 1. Instit. Moral. 2. p. lib. 11. c. 5. q. 10.*
k *In Hercul. Furent.*
l *de Iustit. & jure. c. 9. dub. 4*
m *Chauuesauris polit. n. in resp. ad Aphoris. Calviniſtarū.* o *Contr. Calviniſt. Aphorism. c. 3. ad Aphor. 1.* p *In expoſtul. ad Henrici. Reg. pro Societate.* q *in Apolog. pro Henrico Garnetto.* r *Ad annum Mundi. 2669. n. 7.* s. *Tract. 29. p. 2 de quinto præcepto Decal. n. 12. t. tom. 3. disp. 4. q 8. dub. 3 & 32. 33. opusc. 20. & lib. 1. de regim. Præcip. c. 6.*

tence,

tence, and then to beautify the matter profeſſe that they deny the lawfulneſſe of *Regicidium*, by a private authority. For if the Pope ſentence him then he is no longer a King, and ſo the killing of him is not *Regicidium*, and if any man doth kill him after ſuch ſentence, then he kills him not *privatâ Authoritate*, or *ſinè judicio publico*, which is all they affirm to be unlawfull.

And thus they hope to ſtop the clamour of the world againſt them, yet to have their opinions ſtand intire, the way to their owne ends fair, but the Prince no jot the more ſecure of his life. I doe them no wrong, I appeale to the Authors themſelves, there I will be tryed. For that either the People, or that a Company of learned men, or to be ſure the Pope may licenſe a man to kill the King, they ſpeake it with one voyce, and tongue. And now after all this we may better gueſſe what manner of counſell or threatning (for I know not which to call it) that was which *Bellarmine* gave ſometimes to K. *Iames* of B.M. *Si ſecurus regnare velit Rex, ſi vitæ ſuæ & ſuorum conſulere cupiat, ſinat Catholicos frui religione ſuâ!* If this be good counſell, then in caſe the Catholiques were hindred from the free profeſſion of their Religion, at the beſt it was full of danger if not certaine ruine. But I will no more rake this *Augean* Stable, in my firſt Part I ſhewed it was too Catholique a Doctrine, and too much practis'd by the great *Ciſalpine* Prelate. I adde no more, leaſt truth it ſelfe ſhould bluſh, fearing to become incredible.

In lib. ſub nomine Torti. edit. Colon. Agrip. 1610. pag 21.

Now

Now if we put all theſe things together, and then we ſhould prove to be Heretiques in their account, we are in a faire caſe both Prince and people, if wee can but gueſſe rightly at this wee ſhall need I thinke to looke no further why fire was called for to conſume both our King and Country, nor why we may feare it another time.

The Author of the *Epiſtle of comfort to the Catholiques in priſon* printed by authority in the year of the Powder Treaſon, is very earneſt to perſwade his Catholiques not to come to our Churches or communicate with us in any part of our divine ſervice, affrighting them with the ſtrange *terriculamenta* of halfe Chriſtians, Hypocrites, Denyers of Chriſt, in caſe they joyn'd with us in our Liturgy. Strange affrightments theſe yet not much more then what is true if they eſteeme us Heretiques. For if they thinke us ſo, we are ſo to them, and they communicating with us doe as much ſinne, as if wee were ſo indeed.

Εἰπὲ Κλειτὸς ἢ Λαϊκὸς εἰσέλθῃ εἰς πλὴν συναγωγὴν Ἰεδλαίων, ἢ αἱρετικῶν συνδέξασθαι, καὶ διαιρέσθω, καὶ ἀφορεζέσθω 36 Can. Apoſt. 33 Laodic. ὅτι δεῖ αἱρετικὸς συνοδεῦσαι.

But if wee be not Heretiques what need all this ſtirr *permiſſu Superiorum*. the Counſell of Recuſancy was unreaſonable, dangerous, ſchiſmaticall, and as the caſe then ſtood, very imprudent. In charity to their diſcretion wee cannot but thinke them uncharitable in their opinion of us.

But there is no need we ſhould diſpute our ſelves into a conjecture, themſelves ſpeake out and plaine enough. Heare *Bellarmine* under the viſor of *Tortus*, affirming that the Kings Edict commanded the Catholiques Apol. ad Reg. Angl.

tholiques, to goe to Heretiques Churches, speaking of ours But more plaine is that of *Champ* the *Sorbonist in his Treatise of Vocation of Bishops. Therefore as Arrianisme is a condemn'd Heresy, & the Professors thereof be Heretiques, so likewise is Protestantisme a condemn'd Heresy, and those that Professe it be also Heretiques.*

Cap. 11. pag. 149 Doway. 1616.

By this time wee see too plainly that the state of Protestant Princes is full of danger where these men have to doe. They may be deposed and expelled from the Government of their Kingdomes, they must be deposed by the Catholiques under perill of their soules, it may be done any way that is most convenient, they may be rebelled against, fought with, slaine. For all this, it were some ease, if here we might fixe a *Non ultrà*. For perhaps these *Princes* might put in a *Plea* for themselves, and goe neere to prove themselves to be no Heretiques. All's one, for though they doe, yet unlesse they can perswade his *Holinesse* not to judge them so, or declare them Heretiques, all is to no purprse, for to him they must stand or fall. *Nam iudicare an Rex pertrahat ad hæresim necne pertinet ad Pontificem.* So *Bellarmine* They need not stay till his Heresy be of it selfe manifest, he is then to be us'd like a Heretique *when by the Pope of Rome he shall be judg'd Hereticall.*

But what matter is it if the Pope be judge, for if they may be deposed, as good he as any else. What greivance then, can this be to the state of Princes more then the former? Yes, very much. 1. Because

cauſe the Pope by his order to ſpiritualls may take away Kingdomes upon more pretences then actuall hereſy. It is a large title, and may doe any thing. *Bellarmine* expreſſes it handſomely, and it is the doctrine of their great *Aquinas*. *The Pope* (ſaith he) *by his Spirituall power may diſpoſe of the Temporalties of all the Chriſtians in the World, when it is requiſite to the end of the Spirituall power.* The words are plain that he may doe it for his own ends (for his is the *Spirituall power*) that is, for the advancement of the *See Apoſtolike*, and thus (to be ſure) he did actually wiſh *Frederick Barbaroſſa*, *Iohn* of *Navarre*, the Earle of *Tholouſe*, and our own King *Iohn*. 2. The Pope pretends to a power that to avoid the probable danger of the increaſe of hereſy he may take away a Territory from the right owner, as is reported by the Cardinall *D'Oſſat*, and this is ſoon pretended, for who is there that cannot make probabilities, eſpecially when a Kingdome is at ſtake? 3. We finde examples that the Pope hath excommunicate Princes, and declar'd them hereticks when all the hereſy hath been a not laying their crownes at the feet of *S. Peter*. The caſe of *Lewis* the fourth is every where known, whom *Iohn* the twenty third Excommunicated. *Platina* tels the reaſon. He called himſelfe Emperour without the Popes leave, and aided the *Italian* deputies to recover *Millaine*. Doubtleſſe a moſt damnable and fundamentall hereſy. 4. How if it proves in the Popes account to be a hereſy to defend the immediat right of Princes to their King-

Vbi ſupra.

De regim. Princip.

In Clemens. quinto.

domes, dependant only on God, not on the *See Apostolike*. If this be no hereſy, nor like hereſy to ſay it, I would faine learn the meaning of *Baronius* concerning the book of *Iohannes de Roa*, who ſometimes had been a *Ieſuit*, but then chang'd his order, and became *Auguſtinian*, ſaying, *it was ſentenc'd to the fire before it had eſcaped the preſſe*. And good reaſon, *Nihil enim tale à Patribus ſocietatis didicit*. Good men, they never taught him any ſuch doctrine as is contained in that peſtilent book, *de iuribus principalibus defendendis & moderandis iuſtè*. Now if this be hereſy or like it, to preach ſuch a Doctrine, then likely it will be judg'd hereſy in Princes to doe ſo, that is, to hold their crownes without acknowledgment of ſubordination to S. *Peters* chaire. And if it be not hereſy to doe ſo, it is in their account as bad, for ſo the *Ieſuits* in their *Veritas defenſa* againſt the Action of *Arnald* the Advocate affirme *in terminis*, that the actions of ſome Kings of *France* againſt the Pope in defence of their Regalties, were but *examples of rebellion, and ſpots to diſgrace the purity of the French Lillies*. 5. Put caſe the Pope ſhould chance to miſtake in his ſentence againſt a Prince, for the cauſe of hereſy, yet for all this miſtake, he can ſecure any man to take away the Princes life or Kingdome. His Lawyers will be his ſecurity for this point. For although in this caſe, the depoſition of the Prince ſhould be, and be acknowledged to be againſt Gods law, the Prince being neither Tyrant nor heretick, yet his Holineſſe commanding it, takes

Baron. tom. 6. Annal. An. Dom 447. n 8

takes away the unlawfulneſſe of it, by his diſpenſation. So *D. Marta*, and for this doctrine he quotes *Hoſtienſis*, *Felinus*, *Gratus*, the *Abbat*, the *Arch biſhop of Florence*, *Ancharanus*, *Iohannes Andreas*, *Laurentius de Pinu*, and ſome others. Indeed his Divines deny this, *ſed contrarium tamen obſervatur*, as it's very well obſerved by the ſame Doctor, for he brings the practiſe & example of Pope *Martin* the fifth, *Iulius* the ſecond, *Celeſtine* the third, *Alexander* the third, and *Sixtus quintus*, all which diſpenſed in caſes acknowledged to be expreſſely againſt Gods law. 6. Laſtly. How if the Pope ſhould lay a cláime to all the Kingdomes of the world, as belonging ro S. *Peters* patrimony by right of ſpirituall preheminence? I know no great ſecurity we have to the contrary. For firſt, It is known he hath claimed the Kingdome of *England*, as feudatary to the *See Apoſtolike*. Which when I conſidered I wondred not at that new and inſolent title which *Moſconius* gives his *Holineſſe* of *Defenſor fidei*. He might have added the title of *Rex Catholicus*, & *Chriſtianiſſimus*. For D. *Marta* in his treatiſe of *Iuriſdiction*, which he dedicated to *Paulus quintus*, hath that for an argumẽt why he dedicated his Book to him, becauſe, forſooth the Pope is the only Monarch of the World. But of greater authority is that of *Thomas Aquinas* affirming, the Pope to be the verticall top of all power Ec-

De Iuriſd caſ. 64. n. 14.

Num. 17.

a *Rex Angloriũ eſt ſubditus Romano Pontifici ratione directi dominij quod in Regnum Angliæ & Hiberniæ Romana habet Eccleſia. Bellarm. Apol. adv. R. Angl. c. 5.*

b *De Maieſt. milit. Eccleſ. c. 1. pag. 25.*

c *Tibi à quo emanat omnis iuriſdictio, unicus in orbe Pontifex, Imperator & Rex, omnium Principum ſuperior, rerumq́ & perſonarum ſupremus & Dominus. Epiſt. Dedicat.* d 2 *Sent. diſt. 44. & lib. 3 de Regim. Princ.*

cleſiaſticall and Civill. So that now it may be true which the Biſhop of *Patara* told the Emperor, in behalfe of Pope *Sylverius*. *Multos eſſe Reges, ſed nullum talem, qualis ille, qui eſt Papa ſuper Eccleſiam Mundi totius.*

Lib. erat. in Breviar. de cauſâ Neſtorian cap. 21.

For theſe reaſons I think it is true enough that the conſtituting the Pope the judge of Princes in the matter of depoſition, is of more danger then the thing it-ſelfe. The ſumme is this. However ſchiſme or hereſy may be pretended, yet it is but during the Popes pleaſure that Kings or ſubjects ſhall remain firme in their mutuall neceſſitude. For if our Prince bee but excommunicate or declar'd heretick, then to be a good ſubject will be accounted no better then irreligion and *Anti-Catholiciſme*. If the concluſion be too hard and intolerable then ſo are the Premiſes, and yet they paſſe for good Catholike doctrine among themſelves.

But if truly and *ex animo* they are otherwiſe affected, they ſhould doe well to unſay what hath been ſaid, and declare themſelves by publique authority againſt ſuch doctrines. And ſay whether or no their determinations ſhall be *de fide?* If they be, then all thoſe famous Catholique Doctors, *Thomas Aquinas, Bellarmine, Creſwell, Mariana, Emanuel Sá, &c.* are heretiques, and their Canons teach hereſy, and Many of their Popes to be condemn'd as hereticall, for practiſing and teaching depoſition of Princes by an authority uſurp't againſt, and in prejudice of the Chriſtian faith. But if their anſwers be not *de fide*, then

then they had as good ſay nothing, for the danger is not at all decreaſed, becauſe if there be Doctors on both ſides by their own * aſſertion they may without ſinne follow either, but yet more ſafely if they follow the moſt received and the moſt autho. rized, and whether this rule will lead them, I will be judg'd by any man that hath conſidered the premiſes. Briefly either this thing muſt remain in the ſame ſtate it is, and our Princes ſtill expos'd to ſo extream hazards, or elſe let his *Holineſſe* ſeat himſelfe in his chaire, condemne theſe doctrines, vow againſt their future practiſe, limit his *ordo ad ſpiritualia*, containe himſelfe within the limits of canſes directly and meerely Eccleſiaſticall, diſclaime all power, ſo much as indirect over Princes temporalls, and all this with an intent to oblige all Chriſtendome. Which when I ſee done, I ſhall be moſt ready to believe that nothing in Popery, doth either directly or by a neceſſary conſequence deſtroy Loyalty to our lawfull Prince, but not till then, having ſo much evidence to the contrary.

* Charity maintaind by Cath. cap. 7.

Thus much was occaſion'd by conſideration of the cauſe of the Diſciples *Quære* which was when they ſaw this, that their L. and M. for his difference in Religion was turned forth of doores, which when they ſaw,

They ſaid Lord]. It was well they ask'd at all, and would not too haſtily act what they too ſuddēly had intended, but it was better that they ask'd Chriſt, it had been the beſt warrant they could have had, could

they

they have obtain'd but a *Magiſter dixit*. But this was not likely, it was too ſtrange a Queſtion to aske of ſuch a Mr. *A Magiſtro manſuetudinis licentiam crudelitatis?* Nothing could have come more croſſe to his diſpoſition. His ſpirit never was addicted to blood, unleſſe it were to ſhed his owne. Hee was a Prince of peace and ſet forth to us by all the Symboles of peace and gentleneſſe, as of a *ſheepe, a lambe, a hen*, a gentle twining vine, the *healing Olive*. and is it likely that ſuch a one ſhould give his *placet* to the utter ruine of a company of poore Villagers for denying him a nights lodging moved thereto by the foregoing ſcandall of a Schiſme? Hee knew better what it coſt to redeem a man, and to ſave his life from deſtruction then to bee ſo haſty for his ruine. And if the Fathers *Confeſſors* who were to anſwere the Queſtion of the day had but reflected upon this Goſpell, they might have informed their penitents better then to have engaged them upon ſuch Antichriſtian, and Treaſonable practiſes, as to deſtroy an aſſembly of Chriſtians, as to depoſe or kill a King.

It is the proper cogniſance of Mahumetaniſme, by fire and ſword to maintain their cauſe, and to propagate their Religion, by ruine of Princes and conquering their Kingdomes. But it is the excellency of Chriſtianity, that by humility and obedience it made Princes tributary to our Deare Maſter, and homagers to his Kingdome. When *Valentinian* ſent *Calligonus* his Chamberlaine to *S. Ambroſe* to threa-

ter

ten him from his faith, his answer was, *Deus permittit tibi ut impleas quod minaris. Ego patiar, quod est Episcopi, tu facies quod est spadonis.* He did not stirre up the numerous people of his Dioceſſe to rebell againſt the Emperour, or depoſe him, imployed no agent in his Court to undermine his ſecurity, nor aſſaſine to take his life. He and the reſt of thoſe good Fathers, would not have loſt their poſſibility of being Martyrs, for the world, unleſſe it were by perſwading the Emperours to the Chriſtian faith. *Wee pray for all our Governours, that they might have long life, a ſecure government, a ſafe houſe, ſtrong armies, good ſubjects, quiet world.* So *Tertullian.* *Apologet.*

I had thought that the Doctrine and example of our B. Saviour, the practiſe Apoſtolicall and primitive, had beene tyes enough to keep us in our obedience to God and the King, and in Chriſtian charity to all, but I finde that all theſe precepts come to nothing, for the Apoſtles and primitive Chriſtians did not actually depoſe Kings, nor alter ſtates, nor call for fire to conſume their enemies: not becauſe it was ſimply unlawfull ſo to doe, or any way adverſe to the precepts of Chriſt, but becauſe they wanted Power. So *Bellarmine: The Church gave leave that the faithfull ſhould obey Iulian, becauſe then they wanted forces.* And *F. Creſwell* is very confident of the buſineſſe, *They might without all Queſtion have appointed to themſelves other Kings and Princes, if the Chriſtians had beene ſtrong enough to bring their intendments to paſſe.* But becauſe they could not, *De Pontif. R. l. 5. c. 7.* *Philopater p. 107. n. 158.*

therefore it was not lawfull for them to goe about it, nor is it for us in the same case, *especially if the Prince hath quiet possession, and a strong guard about him, then by no meanes is it lawfull for a single man by his owne authority to assault his Prince that rules Tyrannically.* So *Salmeron*. But who sees not that this way murder may be lawfull. For true it is God commanded us, saying, *Thou shalt not kill*, that is, if thou art not able to lift up thy hand, or strike a stroake; thou shalt not blaspheme, that is, if thou beest speechlesse, thou must be obedient to thy Prince, that is, if thou canst not tell how to helpe it. Good Doctrine this! And indeed it might possibly be something if God had commanded our subordination to Princes only *for wrath*, for then *si vires adsint*, if wee can defend our selves we are secure, wee need not feare his wrath, but when he addes, *also for conscience sake*, I cannot sufficiently wonder that any man should obtrude so senseless, so illiterate, and so impious an interpretation upon the Christian world, under the Title of Catholique Doctrine.

Disp. 5. in c. 13. ad Roman.

Christ when he was betrayed and seized upon by his Murderers could have commanded twelve Legions of Angels for his Guard, *Non defuerunt vires*; and in all humane likelyhood such a *Satellitium* as that would have mov'd them to a beliefe in him, or else I am sure, might have destroyed the unbelievers. Shall I say more against this rude *glossema*? Then thus. It is false that the Primitive Christians had not power to defend themselves against their Persecutors;

tors. Heare *S. Cyprian*; *Nemo noſtrum quando apprehenditur reluctatur, nec ſe adverſus iniuſtitiam, & violentiam veſtram quamvis nimius & copioſus noſter ſit Populus, ulciſcitur.* They could have reſiſted and that to blood, but they had not ſo learned Chriſt. Prayers and teares were the armes of Chriſtians, and then they had a defence beyond all this, when they were hard put to it, *Mori potuerunt*, a ſubmiſſion of their bodies to Martyrdome was their laſt refuge.

Thus S. *Agnes, Lucia, Agatha, Chriſtina, Domitilla* ſav'd both their faith and chaſtity, *non armis, ſed ignibus & carnificis manu*, the tormentors laſt cruelty defended them from all ſucceeding danger.

I will not yet conclude, that, that which theſe men obtrude for Catholique Doctrine is flat and direct hereſy, I will inſtance but once more and then I ſhall. In the fourth Councell of *Toledo* which was aſſembled when the uſurping and Tyrannizing Goths did domineere in Europe, the moſt whereof were Tyrants, Vſurpers, or Arrians; the Councell decreed that if any man did violate the life or perſon of his King, *aut poteſtate Regni exuerit*, kill him or depoſe him, *Anathema ſit &c.* He ſhould be accurſed in the ſight of God and his Holy Angels, and together withall the companions of his iniquity, hee ſhould be ſeparated from the Catholique Church. And now I hope I may ſay that theſe men who either practiſe or adviſe ſuch practiſes as killing or depoſing Kings, are as formally condemn'd for hereſy, and anathematiz'd, as ever was *Manichee* or *Cataphrygian*,

phrygian. I know not, but perhaps this might be thought of when the Iesuits were inscrib'd heretiks upon the publike pillar before the *Louure* in *Paris*, upon their banishment: however, let them answer it as they may, it concernes them as much as their being Catholiques comes to, *Et considerent, quia quæ prædicant tantoperè verba, aut ipsorum summorum Pontificum sunt suas fimbrias extendentium, aut illorum qui eis adulantur*, as said *Æneas Sylvius*, but at no hand can it be Christian Doctrine.

De gestis conc. Basil. lib. 1.

I instanc'd in these things to shew the *Antithesis* between the spirit of our B. Saviour who answer'd the Question of the text, and the Fathers *Confessors* of whom was ask'd the Question of the day.

But give mee leave to consider them not only as misinforming their penitents, but as concealing their intended purpose, for even this way, the persons to whom the Question was propounded made themselves guilty of the intended machination. For by all Law Ecclesiasticall and Civill hee that conceales an intended Murder or Treason makes himselfe as much a party for concealing, as is the Principall for contriving.

a Cap. quantæ de sentent. excom. & c. de delicto ibid. in &. 13. q. 3. q. 3. b l. 1. occisorum ad L. Syllanian. & l 1. §. 1. ad l. Cornel. de falsis l. quisquis ad l Iul. Maiest.

Ob. But these Fathers *Confessors* could not be accused by vertue of these generall Lawes, as being exempt by vertue of speciall case, for they received notice of these things only in confession, the seale of which is so sacred and inviolable, that he is sacrilegious who in any case doth breake it open, though it be to avoid the greatest evill that can happen, so *Bellarmine*,

larmine; to ſave the lives of all the Kings in Chriſtendome, ſo *Binet*; though to ſave a whole common wealth from dammage temporall or ſpirituall, of body or ſoule, ſo *Suarez*. *Apol. adv. R. Angl. Caſaub. ad Front. Duc. In 3 part. D. Thom. diſp. 33. Sect. 1. n. 2.*

A conſiderable matter! On the one ſide wee are threatned by ſacriledge, on the other by danger of Princes and common-wealths, for the caſe may happen, that either the Prince and whole State may be ſuffered to periſh bodily and ghoſtly, or elſe the Prieſt muſt certainly damne himſelfe by the ſacrilegious breach of the holy Seale of confeſſion. Give me leave briefly to conſider it, and, both for the acquittance of our ſtate in its proceedings againſt theſe Traytors, and for the regulating of the caſe it ſelfe, to ſay theſe two things.

1 This preſent Treaſon was not revealed to theſe Fathers Confeſſors in formall confeſſion. 2. If it had, it did not bind to ſecreſy in the preſent caſe. Of the firſt, only a word.

1 It was only propounded to them in way of Queſtion or conſultation (like this in the text) as appeared by their owne confeſſions, and the atteſtation of then *Sr Henry Mountague* Recorder of London to *Garnet* himſelfe. It could not therefore be a formall confeſſion, & therefore not bind to the ſeale. It is the common opinion of their owne Doctors: *Non enim inducitur obligatio ſigilli in confeſſione quam quis facit ſine ullo animo accipiendi abſolutionem, ſed ſolum conſilij petendi cauſâ.* *Vide Caſaub. ep. ad Front. D. p. 133. D. Soto. in 4. l. Sent. d. 18. q. 4 art. 5. concl. 5. Navar. c. 8. n. 28. Suarez. diſp. 33 Sect 2. Coninck de ſigil conf. dub. 2. n. 7.*

2 It was propounded to theſe Fathers *Confeſ-*

sors as a thing not subjicible to their penitentiall judicature, because it was a fact not repented of, but then in agitation, and resolved upon for the future. How then could this be a confession, whose institution must certainly be in order to absolution, and how could this be in any such order; when it was a businesse of which they could not expect to be absolved unlesse they hop'd to sinne with a pardon about their necks; and on condition God would be mercifull to them in its remission, would come and professe that they were resolved to anger him? In reason this could be no act of repentance, neither could it, by confession of their own side. It is the doctrine of *Hostiensis*: and [b] *Navarre*, and [c] Cardinall *Alban* confesse it to be most commonly received.

[b] *Cap Sacerdos. 3. q. n. 116.*

[c] *In lucubrat. ad Bartolum. in L. ut vim, n. 22 ff. de iustitia & iure*

3 It was not only not repented of, but by them reputed to be a good action, and so could not be a matter of confession. I appeal to any of their own *Manuals* and penitentiary bookes. It is culpable say they. I am sure it is ridiculous in any man to confesse and shrive himselfe of a good action, and that this was such in their opinion, it's plaine, by that impious answer of *Garnet*, affirming it a businesse greatly meritorious, if any good might thence accrue to the Catholique cause.

See proceed. against late Traitors.

4 By this their pretended confession they endeavoured to acquire new complices, as is evident *in the proceedings against the Traitors*. They were therefore bound to reveale it, for it neither was nor could

could be a proper and formall confeſſion. That this is the common opinion of their own Schooles, ſee it affirmed by *Ægidius Coninck*. *Vbi ſupra.*

The firſt particular then is plain. Here neither was the forme of confeſſion, nor yet could this thing be a matter of confeſſion, therefore ſuppoſing the ſeale of confeſſion to be ſacredly inviolable in all caſes, yet they were highly blameable for their concealement in the preſent.

2 But the truth of the ſecond particular is more to be inquired of. That is, that though theſe things had been only revealed in confeſſion, and this confeſſion had been formall and direct, yet they were bound in the preſent caſe to reveale it, becauſe the ſeale of confeſſion is not ſo inviolable, as that in no caſe it is to be broken up, and if in any, eſpecially it may be opened in the caſe of treaſon.

I never knew any thing cryed up with ſo generall a voyce upon ſo little ground, as is the *Over-hallowed* ſeale of confeſſion.

True it is that an ordinary ſecret committed to a friend in civill commerce is not to be revealed upon every cauſe, nor upon many, (but upon ſome it may as they all confeſſe.) If thus, then much rather is this to be obſerved in the revelation of the ſecrets of our conſciences, not only from the ordinary tye to ſecrecy, but likewiſe leaſt ſinnes ſhould grow more frequent, if ſo great a remedy of them be made ſo odious, as to expoſe us to a publike infamy or danger of the law. The Councell therefore that firſt introduc'd

duc'd, this obligation was very prudent and reasonable, pleads a thousand yeares prescription, and relies upon good conveniences. This is all that ever could be prov'd of it (as may appeare anon) but these are too weak a base, to build so great a structure on it, as to make it sacriledge, or any sinne at all, to reveale confessions in some cases.

1 For first, if because it is delivered as a secret, and such a secret, it is the more closely and religiously to be kept; it is true, but concludes no more, but that it must be a greater cause that must authorize a publication of this, then of the secrets of ordinary commerce between friend and friend.

2 If the licensing of publicatiō of confessiō be a way to make confessiō odious, and therefore that it may not be publish'd, I say if this concludes, then on the contrary it concludes farre more strongly, that therefore in some cases it may be published, because nothing can make a thing more odious and intolerable, then if it be made a cover for grand impieties, so as to engage a true subject, quietly & Knowingly to see his Prince murdred.

3 If it be discouragement to the practise of confessiō that some sinnes revealed in it must be publisheḍ though with perill to the delinquents fame & life, then it will be a farre greater discouragement to the sinne, when that it shall by an universall judgement be so detested, that its concealement may not be permitted, though it be with the hazard of discouraging the Holy duty of confessiō: and when

the

the being guilty of ſuch a ſinne, ſhall reduce men into ſuch ſtreights, that either they ſhall want the benefit of abſolution, or ſubmit themſelves to a publike ſatisfaction, and ſo even in this particular the benefit is farre greater then the imaginary inconvenience.

The conveniences of the Seale force no more then that it is convenient to be obſerved, not ſimply and abſolutely in all caſes neceſſary. And perhaps *Suarez* the great patron of it perceived it, however he laies the burden, *ſuper communi conſenſu Eccleſiæ, eiuſq; perpetuâ traditione.* If then I can ſhew, that there is no ſuch *Catholike* conſent of the preſent Church, nor any univerſall tradition of the *ancient* Church for the inviolable Seale, but plainly the contrary, then our Church in her permiſſion of the Prieſts to reveale ſome confeſſions is as inculpable as thoſe of the preſent Church, who (beſides her ſelfe) teach and practiſe it, and as the Primitive Church whoſe, example in this (as in other things) ſhe ſtrictly followes. *In 3. part. D Thom. diſp. 33. ſect. 1. n. 2*

Of the firſt. The Church of *England*, which obſerves the ſeale of confeſſion as ſacredly as reaſon or religion it ſelfe can poſſibly permit, yet forbids not diſcloſure in caſe of Murder or Treaſon, but in theſe particulars leaves us intire in our obedience to the common lawes of *England*, and theſe command it. *Can. 113. A. D. 1604.*

That the Church of England gives leave in ſome caſes to reveale confeſſions, is argument enough to prove that the Seale is not founded upon the con-

sent of the present *Catholike Church*. For it is no more a begging of the Question (nor apparently so much) to say, the Church of *England* is a part of the Catholike Church, and therefore her consent is required to make a thing universall, then to say, the Church of *Rome* is the whole *Catholike Church*, therefore her consent is sufficient to make a thing Catholike. But I shall not need to proceed this way. For,

1 It is apparent that of their own side *Altisidiorensis* largely and professedly proves the lawfulnesse of publication in some cases as is to be seen. *Lib.* 4. *Summa tract.* 6 *cap.* 3. *q.* 7. and *Garnet* himselfe, the man who if any had most need to stand in defence of the *Seale* that the pretence of it might have defended him, yet confessed of his own accord, *Leges quæ celare hæc prohibent apprimè esse justas & salutares*. He addes his reason, and that is more then his authority, for (saith he) it is not fitting that the life and safety of a Prince should depend upon the private nicetys of any mans conscience. If two, nay if one dissent, it is enough to destroy a consent. But see farther.

Actio in prodit. lat. p. 99.

There are many cases, generally confessed amongst themselves, in which the seale of formall and (as they love to speak) *Sacramentall* confession may be broken open. I instance but in two or three.

First, confession may be reveal'd to clear a doubtfull case of marriage. It is the opinion of many great *Canonists*, as you may see them quoted by *Suarez de*

Practic. crim. Eccles. cap. 109.

Paz,

Paz. and *Covaruvias*, and the case of the *Venetian* who married a Virgin that was both his sister and daughter: and that at *Rome* under Pope *Paul* the third almost to like purpose, were long disputed on both sides, whether they were to be revealed or not, so that at most, it is but a doubtfull matter in such cases, whether the tye of secrecy doth oblige. Now if for the proofe of marriage the seale may be broken up, that man and wife might live contentedly and as they ought, strange it should be unlawfull to reveale confessions in case of Treason, for the safety of a Prince or State! *Resol. de Matrimon.*

2 In case of heresy the seale binds not, by their own generall confession. It is a rule amongst them,

Hæresis est crimen quod non confessio celat.

Now I would fain learn why Treason is not as revealeable as Heresy? Is heresy dangerous to soules? Then surely, so is Treason, unlesse it be none, or a very small crime. May heresy infect others? So may Treason, as it did in the present. It may then as well be revealed as heresy. Now that it may something rather, I have these reasons. 1. Because it is not so certaine that such an opinion is heresy as that such a fact is Treason. 2. Because although both Treason and reall heresy be damnable and dangerous to soules, yet heresy kills no Kings as treason doth. I confesse that heresy may, and doth teach it, but then it degenerates into Treason. Now if some heresy may be Treason, then that Treason is heresy, & so a case of Treason may occurre, in which from

their own confeſſion, treaſon is revealeable.

3 By the moſt generall voice of their own ſide any man may licence his confeſſor to reveale his confeſſion. It is the doctrine of *Scotus*, *Durandus*, *Almain*, *Navarre*, *Medina*, and generally of all the *Thomiſts*. I inferre, if a private man may licence his *Confeſſor* to reveale his confeſſion, then the ſeale of confeſſion is not founded upon any divine commandement, for if it were, the penitent could not give the Prieſt licenſe to break it. But if the penitent may give his *Confeſſor* leave, becauſe the tye of ſecrecy is a bond in which the Prieſt ſtands bound to the penitent, & he giving him leave, remits of his own right, then much rather may a whole State authoriſe this publication, for what ever perſonall right a private man hath, that the whole State hath much rather, for he is included in it as a part of the whole, and in ſuch caſes as concerne the whole commonwealth (as this of treaſon doth moſt eſpecially) the rule of the Law holds without exception, *Refertur ad univerſos quod publicè fit per maiorem partem*, the delinquent gives leave to the publication of confeſſion, therefore becauſe the whole ſtate doth, whereof he is one member. I adde, that in the caſe of Treaſon this is much rather true, for here the delinquent looſeth all his right whatſoever, prædiall, perſonall, and of priviledge, & therefore the Commonwealth can the better licenſe the publication, and the breach of the bond of ſecrecy, in which the *Confeſſor* ſtood tyed to the penitent by vertue of implicit ſtipulation.

L. quod Maior ff. ad Municipalem.

ff. de regul juris. ad §. refertur.

L. 7 §. ult. ff. de pact.

4.

4 Laſtly, even in ſpeciall in the very caſe of Treaſon confeſſed, many of their owne doe actually practiſe a publication, when either they are loyall of themſelves, or dare not be otherwiſe.

I inſtance firſt in the Church of *France*. For this See *Bodinus*, who reports of a *Norman* Gentleman whom his *Confeſſor* diſcovered for having confeſſed a Treaſonable purpoſe he ſometimes had, of killing *Francis* the firſt, of which hee was penitent, did his penance, craved abſolutiõ obtain'd it but yet was ſentenc'd to the axe by expreſſe commiſſion from the King to the Parliament of *Paris*. The like confeſſion was made by the Lord of *Haulteville* when he was in danger of death, which when he had eſcaped, he incurred it with the diſadvantage of publike infamy upon the Scaffold. I inſtance not in the caſe of *Barriere*, it is every where knowne as it is reported partly by *Thuanus*, but more fully by the Authour of *Hiſtoire de la paix*. Nor yet is *France* ſingular in the practiſe of publication of confeſſed Treaſon. For at *Rome* there have been examples of the like, I meane of thoſe who confeſſed their purpoſe of killing the Pope, who were revealed by their *Confeſſors*, and accordingly puniſh'd.

De republ. lib. 2. cap. 5.

Hiſtoire de la paix.

Dominic. à soto. memb. 3. q 4. concl. 2 de rat. regendi ſecret.

Thus then the firſt pretence proves a nullity, & either our Laws are juſt in commanding publication of confeſſion in caſe of Treaſõ, or themſelves very culpable in teaching & practiſing it in the ſame, & in caſes of leſſe moment. The 2d is like the firſt for it is extremly vain to pretend that the ſeale of confeſſion is

founded upon *Catholike* traditiõ. Iudg by the sequel.

Lib 7. hist. c. 16. Τὰς μοιχὰς διὰ τέλους σωφρονήσας καὶ ἐξαρκέσας δι' ἀλλαβείαν ἀνωσιδίην ἐκ ἐκίλδσαν οἱ Πατέρες ἡμῶν. *Epist. ad Amphil.*

The first word I heare of concealing confessions is in *Sozomen*, relating how the *Greeke Church* about the time of *Decius* the Emperor, set over the penitẽts a publike penitentiary Priest, who was bound to be *Vir bonæ conversationis, servansq; secretum, a good man and a keeper of secrets*, for indeed he was bound to conceale some crimes, in particular those which an Adultéresse had confessed, I meane concerning her Adultery, as appeares in the Canons of *S. Basil*. But yet this Priest who was so tyed to a religious secrecy did *publish many of them in the Congregation before the people*, that they might reprove the delinquent and discountenance the sinne. The same story is reported by *Cassiodore*, and *Nicephorus* from the same Authour.

Homil. 2. in 37. Psal.

The lawfulnesse and practise of publication in some cases is as cleere in *Origen*. *If* (saith he) *the Physician of thy soule perceives thy sinnes to be such as to need so harsh a remedy as to have them published before the assemblies of the people, that others may be admonished, & thou the better cured, he need be very deliberate, and skilfull in the application of it*. Hitherto no such thing as an Vniversall tradition for the pretended inviolable *sacramentall seale*, for *Origen* plainly, and by them confessedly speakes of such sins as first were privately confessed to the Priest; how else should hee deliberate of their publication? but yet he did so, and for all the seale of confession, sometimes opened many of them, to no fewer witnesses

neſſes then a whole aſſembly. Thus it was in the *Greeke Church* both Law and Cuſtome. But now if we look into the *Latine Church* wee ſhall find that it was taken up from example of the *Greeks* and ſome while practis'd, that ſome particular ſinnes ſhould be publiſhed in the Church before the Congregation, as it is confeſſed in the Councell of *Mentz*, and inſerted by *Burchard* into his *Decree*. *Cap. 10. & 21. l. 19. c. 37.*

But when the *Lay* piety began to coole, and the zeale of ſome Clergy men waxe too hot, they would needs heighten this *cuſtome* of publication of *ſome* ſinnes to a *Law* of the publiſhing of *all* ſinnes. This being judg'd to be inconvenient, expreſſed the firſt decree for the ſeale of confeſſion in the *Latin Church*. Now ſee how it is utter'd, and it wil ſufficiently informe us both of the practiſe and the opinion which *Antiquitie* had of the obligation to the ſeale.

Illam contra Apoſtolicam regulam præſumptionem, &c. that is, *it was againſt the Apoſtolicall ordinance that a Law ſhould enjoyn that the Prieſt ſhould reveale all thoſe ſinnes which had beene told him in confeſſion.* It might be done ſo it were not *requir'd* and *exacted*, and yet might be ſo *requir'd*, ſo it were not a publication of all. *Non enim omnium hujuſmodi ſunt peccata*; ſaith *S. Leo*, ſome ſinnes are inconvenient to be publiſhed, it is not fit the world ſhould know all, therefore, ſome they might, or elſe hee had ſaid nothing. The reaſon which he gives makes the buſineſſe ſomewhat clearer, for hee derives it not *Decret S. Leonis. P. M. Epiſt. 80. ad Epiſc. Campan.*

from

from any ſimple neceſſity of the thing or a *Divine Right*, but leaſt men out of inordinate love to themſelves, *ſhould rather refuſe to be waſh't then buy their purity with ſo much ſhame. The whole Epiſtle hath many things in it excellently to the ſame purpoſe.*

I ſay no more, the Doctrine and practiſe of antiquity is ſufficiently evident, and that there is nothing leſſe then an *Vniverſall tradition* for the ſeale of confeſſion to be obſerved in all caſes, even of ſins of the higheſt malignity.

Thus theſe Fathers *Confeſſors* are made totally inexcuſable by concealing a Treaſon which was not revealed to them in a formall confeſſion, and had been likewiſe culpable though it had, there being as I have ſhowne, no ſuch ſacredneſſe of the *Seale* as to be inviolable in all caſes whatſoever.

I have now done with the ſeverall conſiderations of the perſons to whom the Queſtion was propounded, they were the Fathers *Confeſſors* in the day, but it was Chriſt the Lord in my text. The Queſtion it ſelfe followes.

Shall we command fire to come from heaven and conſume them?

The Queſtion was concerning the fate of a whole Towne of *Samaria*, in our caſe it was more; of the Fate of a whole Kingdome. It had been well if ſuch a Queſtion had been ſilenc'd by a direct negative or (as the Iudges of the Areopage uſed to doe) put off *ad diem longiſſimum*, that they might have expected the anſwer three ages after.

De

De morte hominis nulla est cunctatio longa,
No demurre had been too long in a case of so much and so royall blood, the blood of a King, of a Kings Children, of a Kings Kingdome. Πεπαμ& Πεπαμοῖοπ παῖδες, King and Kingdome should have & been made a solemne sacrifice to appease their solemn deliberate malice. I said deliberate, for they were loth to be malicious without good advice, and therefore they askt their question, worthy of an Oracle, even no lesse then *Delphick*, where an evill spirit was the *Numen*, and a Witch the Prophet. For the Question was such of which a Christian could not doubt; though he had been fearefully scrupulous in his resolutions. For whoever question'd the unlawfulnesse of murder, of murdering innocents, of murdering them who were confessed righteous? for such was their proposall, being rather willing that *Catholiks* should perish with those whom they thought, hereticks, then rhat their should be no blood spilt. But to the question: it was fire they called for. The most merciless of all the Elements. No possibility of relenting when once kindled and had its object. It was the fittest instrument for mercilesse men, men of no bowels whose malice like their instrument did *agere ad extremum suarum virium*, worke to the highest of its possibility. Secondly, It was fire indeed they called for, but not like that in my text, not fire from heaven, They might have called as long and as loud as those Priests did, who contested with *Elisha*, no fire would have come from heaven to have consum'd what they had intended for a sacrifice. Gods *Anathema's* post

not so fast as ours doe. *Deus non est sicut homo.* Man curseth often when God blesseth, men condemne whom God acquits, and therefore they were loath to trust God with their cause, they therefore take it into their own hands. And certainly if to their *Anathemas* they adde some fagots of their own and gunpowder, 'tis oddes but then we may be consum'd indeed, and so did they, their fire was not from heaven.

Lastly, it was a fire so strange, that it had no example. The Apostles indeed pleaded a mistaken precedent for the reasonablenesse of their demand, they desir'd leave to doe but *even as Elias did.* [The *Greekes* only retaine this clause, it is not in the Bibles of the Church of *Rome*] and really these *Romano-barbari* could never pretend to any precedent for an act so barbarous as theirs. *Adrimelech* indeed kil'd a King, but he spar'd the people, *Haman* would have killed the people, but spared the King, but that both King and people, Princes and Iudges, branch, and rush and root should dye at once (as if *Caligula's* were actuated and all England upon one head) was never known till now, that all the malice in the world met in this as in a center. The *Sicilian* evensong, the mattins of *S. Bartholomew*, known for the pittilesse and damn'd massacres, were but κάπνε σκιας ὄναρ, the dream of the shadow of smoake if compar'd with this great fire. *In tam occupato sæculo fabulas Vulgaris nequitia non invenit.* This was a busy age; *Herostratus* must have invented a more sublim'd malice then the burning of one Temple, or not have been

bee n ſo much as ſpoke of ſince the diſcovery of the *Powder-Treaſon*. But I muſt make more haſt I ſhall not elſe clime the ſublimity of this impiety. *Nero* was ſometimes the *populare odium* was popularly hated, and deſerv'd it too, for he ſlew his Maſter, and his wife and all his family once or twice over, opened his mothers wombe, fired the Citty, laught at it, ſlandred the Chriſtians for it, but yet all theſe were but *principia malorum*, the very firſt rudiments of evill. Adde then to theſe, *Herods* Maſter-piece at *Ramah* as it was deciphred by the teares and ſad threnes of the Matrons in an Vniverſall mourning for the loſſe of their pretty infants, yet this of *Herod* will prove but an *infant* wickedneſſe, and thar of *Nero*, the evill but of one citty. I would willingly have found out an example, but I ſee I cannot, ſhould I put into the ſcale the extract of all the old *Tyrants* famous in Antique ſtories,

Briſtoni; ſtabulum Regis, Buſiridis aras,
Antiphatæ menſas & Taurica regna Thoantis,

Should I take for true ſtory the higheſt cruelty as it was fancied by the moſt hieroglyphicall *Egyptian*, this alone would weigh them down, as if the *Alpes* were put in ſcale againſt the duſt of a ballance. For had this accurſed Treaſon proſper'd, we ſhould have had the whole Kingdome mourne for the ineſtimable loſſe of its chiefeſt glory, its life, its preſent joy, and all its very hopes for the future. For ſuch was their deſtind malice, that they would not only have inflicted ſo cruell a blow, but have made it incurable, by cutting off our ſupplies of joy, the whole ſuc-

ceſſion of the *line Royall*. Not only the Vine it ſelfe but all the *Gemmulæ*, and the tender *Olive branches* ſhould either have been bent to their intentions, and made to grow crooked, or elſe been broken.

And now after ſuch a ſublimity of malice, I will not inſtance in the ſacrilegious ruine of the neighbouring Temples which needs muſt have periſhed in the flame, nor in the diſturbing the aſhes of our intomb'd Kings devouring their dead ruines like *Sepulchrall dogs*, theſe are but minutes, in reſpect of the ruine prepared for the living Temples.

Prudent. hymn.

Stragem ſed iſtam non tulit
Chriſtus cadentum Principum
Impune, ne forſan ſui
Patris periret fabrica.
Ergo quæ poterit lingua retexere
Laudes Chriſte tuas, qui domitum ſtruis
Infidum populum cum Duce perfido?

Let us then returne to God *the cup of thanks-giving*, he having powred forth ſo largely to us of *the cup of ſalvation*. We cannot want wherewithall to fill it, here is matter enough for an eternall thankfulneſſe, for the expreſſiou of which a ſhort life is too little, but let us here begin our *Hallelujahs* hoping to finiſh them hereafter, where the many quires of Angels will fill the conſort.

Pſal. 135. v. 20. 21. *Praiſe the Lord ye houſe of Levi, ye that fear the Lord, Praiſe the Lord. Praiſe the Lord out of Sion, which dwelleth at Hieruſalem.*

FINIS.